

Section on

NEUROLOGY

Communist Interrogation and Indoctrination of "Enemies of the States"

Analysis of Methods Used by the Communist State Police (A Special Report)

LAWRENCE E. HINKLE Jr., M.D.

and

HAROLD G. WOLFF, M.D., New York

Table of Contents

- | | |
|--|--|
| I: Introduction | 19. Public Confessions |
| II: Practices of the KGB | 20. Punishment |
| 1. Background of the Russian State Police | III: Practices in Communist China |
| 2. Present Structure of the KGB | 1. A Comparison of Chinese Methods with Those of the KGB |
| 3. The Suspect | 2. Background and Organization of the Chinese State Police |
| 4. The Accumulation of Evidence | 3. The Suspects |
| 5. The Arrest Procedure | 4. Investigation and Arrest |
| 6. The Detention Prison | 5. Chinese Prison Routine |
| 7. The Regimen Within the Detention Prison | 6. The Interrogator |
| 8. Effects of the Regimen Within the Isolation Cell | 7. The Interrogation Procedure |
| 9. The Feelings and Attitudes of the Prisoner During the Isolation Regimen | 8. The Indoctrination Procedure in the Group Cell |
| 10. Other Pressures of the Isolation Regimen | 9. The Reaction of the Prisoner to the Procedure in the Cell |
| 11. The Interrogator | 10. The Conversion |
| 12. Interrogation | 11. The Trial |
| 13. Pressures Applied by the Interrogator | 12. The "Brain-Washed" |
| 14. The "Friendly Approach" | 13. Effectiveness of Chinese Communist Indoctrination Procedures |
| 15. The Course of the Interrogation | IV: Relation of State Police Procedures, Military Interrogation, and Indoctrination of Civilians and Prisoners of War in Communist Countries |
| 16. The Psychological Interaction Between Prisoner and Interrogator | V: Some Theoretical Considerations |
| 17. The Reaction of the Prisoner to the Interrogation | VI: Epitome |
| 18. The "Trial" | |

Submitted for publication May 31, 1956.

New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center.

The information contained in this paper was assembled at a time when the authors were serving as consultants to the Department of Defense. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the U. S. Government. The authors wish to acknowledge that the data upon which this report was based were accumulated through the selfless efforts of many able people, who must remain anonymous.

I. Introduction

THE COMMUNISTS are skilled in the extraction of information from prisoners and in making prisoners do their bidding. It has appeared that they can force men to confess to crimes which have not been committed, and then, apparently, to believe in the truth of their confessions and express sympathy and gratitude toward those who have imprisoned them. Many have found it hard to understand that the Communists do not possess new and remarkable techniques of psychological manipulation. Some have recalled the confessions of men such as Cardinal Mindszenty and William Oatis and the unusual behavior of the old Bolsheviks at the purge trials in the 1930's, and have seen an alarming parallel. These prisoners were men of intelligence, ability, and strength of character. They had every reason to oppose their captors. Their confessions were palpably untrue. Such behavior is, if anything, more difficult to explain than that of some of our prisoners of war in Korea.

The techniques used by the Communists have been the subject of speculation. A number of theories about them have been advanced, most of them suggesting that these techniques have been based upon some modification of the conditioned reflex techniques of I. P. Pavlov, the Russian neurophysiologist. The term "brain washing," originated by a reporter who interviewed Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, has caught the public fancy and has gained wide acceptance. Various authors have attempted to provide a scientific definition for this term. This has had the effect of confirming the general impression that "brain washing" is an esoteric technique for the manipulation of human behavior, designed by "scientific investigators" on the basis of laboratory experiments and controlled observations, and producing highly predictable results.

Many of the public speculations about "brain washing" are not supported by the available evidence. However, the Communists do make an orderly attempt to obtain information from their prisoners, and to convert their prisoners to forms of behavior and belief acceptable to their captors. They have had some success in their efforts, and this success has had a good deal of propaganda value for them. For this reason, if for no other, it is important that we have as clear an understanding as possible about how these methods originated, how they are applied, their effectiveness, and their purpose.

The information contained in this report was obtained from a number of sources. Details of the Communist arrest and interrogation systems, and a great deal of information about the purposes, attitudes, and training of those who administer them, were obtained from experts in the area, who for security reasons must remain anonymous.

Knowledge of the prisoners' reactions to their experiences was obtained by the direct observation of persons recently released from Communist prisons. Some of these observations continued for weeks and were supplemented by follow-up observations over periods of months. They included complete physical, neurological, and psychiatric examinations, and often psychological testing as well. They were supplemented by information supplied by families, friends, and former associates. Among those studied intensively were military and civilian prisoners of diverse ranks and backgrounds, women as well as men, defectors and resisters, persons "brain-washed" and "not brain-washed," some who admittedly cooperated with their captors and some who said they did not.

In supplement to this, pertinent information from investigations carried out

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

by the U. S. Army and the U. S. Air Force and from the material assembled for the Defense Advisory Committee on Prisoners of War has been utilized. The very large public literature on these subjects has been reviewed also, and drawn upon when it was helpful. Finally, various laboratory and clinical investigations have been carried out in order to throw light upon the psychological and physiological processes involved in some of the interrogation and indoctrination procedures.

The evidence from every source has been consistent with that from the others and provides a basis for confidence in the validity of the statements which are made in this report and the conclusions which have been drawn from them, which may be summarized thus:

1. The interrogation methods used by the state police in Communist countries are elaborations and refinements of police practices, many of which were known and used before the Russian Communist Revolution.
2. The principles and practices used by the Communist state police in the development of suspects, the accumulation of evidence, and the carrying out of arrest, detention, interrogation, trial, and punishment are known. The effects of these upon prisoners are known also.
3. The "confessions" obtained by Communist state police are readily understandable as results of the methods used.
4. Communist methods of indoctrinating prisoners of war were developed by the Russians and subsequently refined by the Chinese. These methods and their effects are known also.
5. Chinese methods of dealing with political prisoners and "enemies of the state" were adapted from those of the Russians.
6. The intensive indoctrination of political prisoners is a practice primarily used by the Chinese Communists. The methods used in this indoctrination are known, and their effects are understandable.

Part II. Practices of the KGB

1. Background of the Russian State Police

It is illuminating to consider Communist behavior in the light of the doctrines espoused by those who are committed to Communism. Lenin and the other old Bolsheviks who established the Russian Communist Party had spent most of their lives as underground revolutionaries and terrorists, as prisoners, as exiles in Siberia, and as refugees and plotters in various parts of Europe. They accepted behavior which would have been called criminal had it not been carried out in the name of political reform. The unique contributions which they made to Communism were their willingness to use any means in order to attain Socialist ends, their insistence upon religious dedication to the Party, and their demand for unquestioned obedience to Party directives. Their chief concern was not with ideals, but with means of attaining power, ostensibly for the Party and "the people."

In the Byzantine Empire, from which the Russians received much of their cultural heritage, internal espionage and the arbitrary exercise of power by a bureaucracy reporting only to the Emperor were prominent features. As Russia developed from feudalism into a national state under Ivan the Terrible, a centralized, independent, and all-powerful bureaucracy was established, responsible only to the monarch. Subsequent Czars were perhaps less terrible than Ivan, but no less ruthless. The chancery of the Imperial Court was always independent and arbitrary, and the "rights of individual men" of all ranks never had the meaning in Russia which they had in Western Europe, even under absolute monarchs. In all of the period prior to 1917 the secret police system

in Russia was probably the most highly organized, effective, and powerful of that of any European state.

By the early decades of the present century, most of the features which characterized present-day secret police systems had already been evolved, and were exhibited by the Czarist Okhrana. The Okhrana at that time was nationwide, and centrally directed. It was empowered to make arrests and to punish arbitrarily without regard for other legal institutions. Its operations were secret; they were concealed from other arms of the government and the armed services, as well as from the general population. It operated through a great number of spies and informers, who were recruited by payment, threat, or compromise from among the general population, and especially from among criminals and those suspected of political activity against the state. Its apparatus extended even into the highest arms of all branches of the government; neither officials nor private citizens were immune from suspicion or arrest by it.

The Okhrana had learned to use many modern secret police procedures also. It had means of getting people to implicate themselves in criminal activity when there was a desire to compromise them or their associates. It shared with other police systems practices which had developed over a period of many years and which experience had shown to be effective in extracting information and confessions from persons suspected of crimes. These methods were known to police systems all over the world, and many of them are still in use at the present day.

Prisoners of the Okhrana were aware that they could be held indefinitely without trial, under very severe conditions of inadequate food, filth, lack of sanitation or exercise, and continuous interrogation. They knew that ultimately they might be banished or executed arbitrarily, if they did not die of other causes. All of this knowledge, and all of the pressures of their treatment, acted powerfully upon those who were exposed to it. It would be wrong to suppose that the Czarist police were either as effective or as thorough as those in modern Russia and other Communist states, but many of the practices used by these modern Communist police have been in use for many years and were well known long before the Communist Revolution.

Reform of the prison system was one of the foremost tenets of all of the prerevolutionary socialist parties, to which Bolsheviks subscribed no less than others. As far as the Bolsheviks were concerned, these reforms might be generally stated thus: The secret police apparatus was to be abolished outright, and those who had taken part in it were to be punished; the old prison system was to be abolished also. In the new state, the police would be the friends of the people and the guardian of their interests. Those who had committed crimes would not be tried before "arbitrary courts," with all the legal apparatus used in Western nations, for the courts in Western nations were thought of as arms of bourgeois tyranny, in which the wealthy secured justice and the poor injustice. Communist courts would dispense Communist justice. In the Communist state, the criminal would be detained in a place of detention. This would be not a prison but a place in which the accused could sit down with those who arrested him and discuss the crimes which he had committed and the reasons why he had committed them. No one would be arrested unless it was clear that he had committed a crime. If the prisoner would not admit his crimes, or if he were not aware that he had committed criminal acts, by persuasion and

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

teaching he would be brought to understand the nature of his crimes and the reason why they were injurious to the interest of the people. Having come to understand his crimes, and the necessity for his punishment, the prisoner and the court might agree upon the type of punishment and reeducation which should be carried out. The prisoner would have an opportunity to make a written statement of his deposition, with a declaration that no force had been put upon him in order to obtain it. After the investigation of his case had been completed, he would be taken before the court, where he could explain his crimes, and his sentence would be passed. It was only after this sentencing that he would actually be put in prison. Nor would the new prisons be like the old. In them, the prisoner would be allowed to reform and rehabilitate himself by wholesome work and reeducation, instead of being incarcerated in a cell. Ultimately he would rejoin the socialist society as a "new man."

After the 1917 Revolution the Czarist secret police system was abolished. For a few months Russia operated without secret police. But when they were threatened by counter-revolution and chaos, it did not take the Communists long to turn to the idea of reestablishing a secret police system, this time controlled by the Communist Party. In November, 1917, Lenin established the "Cheka," or "Extraordinary Commission," for the suppression of counter-revolutionary activities, with the power of summary arrest, judgment, and execution. Under this euphemism the secret police system was reincarnated. At its head Lenin placed Felix Dzerzhinsky, a dedicated revolutionary, who gathered around him a group of zealous young Bolsheviks that were regarded as the cream of the Communist Party, the guardians of its principles and its power. It was long a proud boast among Communists when one said that he was "an old Chekist." But these men also shared a conspiratorial background, a willingness to use any means to attain their ends, and a freedom from "bourgeois morality."

The Chekists thought of themselves as members of a new order sweeping away the old, but what they inherited was the old Czarist prison system and all of the apparatus that went with it. They also inherited the concepts and attitudes of old Russia to a much greater degree than is generally realized, for these were the concepts and attitudes under which they and all other Russians had been reared. Just what proportion of the former personnel of the Okhrana and the old Russian prison system was utilized by the Cheka at the outset is not known; but it is a safe assumption that at the working level many of the police, the jailers, the spies, and the investigators used by the Cheka had been previously employed by its predecessor.* This is not to say that the Chekists did not set up their apparatus in accordance with Communist theory. It is characteristic of the Communists that they organize all of their institutions in a manner which is nominally in accordance with their theory. A rational and idealistic purpose is ascribed to every aspect of their actions. This is no less true of the police system than of any other segment of the Communist state.

Since that time the secret police system in Russia has passed through a number of reorganizations and has appeared under several names. The relation between the secret police system and the Ministry of Internal Affairs is confusing to those not intimately acquainted with the ramifications of the Soviet bureaucracy, for this Ministry also has been reorganized under a number of

*In this connection it is of interest that the Communist parties of Eastern Europe have absorbed many former Nazis and police operatives from the old regime into their new police system.

names, and from time to time the state police have been under its nominal jurisdiction. It is a popular custom to use the same initials to denote both the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the secret police system, but it is important to distinguish between the two. Since the purging of Beria, in 1953, the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD) and the State Police (KGB—Committee for State Security) have been administratively separate. In this report we shall refer to the Soviet State Police as the KGB. Where the terms Cheka, GPU, OGPU, NKVD, and MVD are used, it is understood that they refer to the state police functions of these former organizations, and not to their other functions, which were various.

There is a wealth of evidence that the methods of pressure, interrogation, and persuasion which are now used by state police throughout the Communist world had been developed in all of their essentials before the purge trials of 1936-1939. The differences between these methods and those which we can assume were inherited from the Okhrana in 1918 are chiefly improvements of organization and refinements of technique and the addition of the persuasive activities of the interrogator with his Communist logic. Tradition has it that these refinements were introduced by the Cheka. According to one report, Dzerzhinsky himself designed the methods of the Cheka, drawing upon his experience with the Polish police, as well as that of the Okhrana and the Bolshevik Party. Present-day KGB officers look upon the "ideological approach" and persuasive activities of the interrogator as the distinctive feature of the method of the KGB, and the one which is responsible for most of its effectiveness. Careful planning and the detailed organization of the arrest and interrogation procedures are important aspects of the KGB procedures, but are not unique.

The mass indoctrination of prisoners of war is a different matter. This appears to have been originated by the NKVD. At the outbreak of war between Germany and the Soviet Union, in 1941, the interrogation and subsequent internment of military prisoners was the function of the Red Army. Prior to 1943 the Russians took few German prisoners, and most of those who fell into their hands were murdered or otherwise disposed of by front-line military units. Very few Germans who were captured in 1941 and 1942 survived the war. This became a problem to the Soviet High Command, which was being deprived of the military information which might be obtained from prisoners-of-war interrogation. A directive was issued in the spring of 1942 to the effect that the lives of prisoners should be protected in order that the information which they possessed might be obtained from them. The custody of prisoners behind the area of combat was turned over to the NKVD in 1943. During the next two years this organization developed the methods of interrogating and indoctrinating prisoners of war which were subsequently adopted by the Chinese Communist Army and eventually, with many Chinese modifications, were used upon our military personnel in Korea.

Because the methods of the Russian state police became the model for those used in other Communist countries, they shall be considered in detail. At the time of writing (January, 1956) there are public reports that the Russian state police are in temporary eclipse, and their activities are said to have been restricted; but there is every reason to believe that this is only partially true. The reader should bear in mind that, in effect, some form of state police system has existed in Russia since the 17th century. From time to time public resent-

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

ment has caused the organization having this function to be "reformed," or even "abolished," but it has always reappeared within a few years, often under a new name, but operating in the same manner. This has been true under the Communists no less than under the Czars.

2. Present Structure of the KGB

The KGB, like its predecessors, is directed from Moscow. Within Russia it is divided into sections, which correspond to the various federal republics, and subsections, corresponding to districts, or oblasts. Within each of these districts the organization has an investigation section, which is primarily concerned with the detection, arrest, and punishment of those who commit crimes against the state. The functions of this section are conducted primarily by a group of relatively junior officers in their late 20's or 30's, each of whom has been especially trained for this type of work. These men operate under the direction of superiors, who ultimately report to Moscow. It is the task of these junior KGB officers to become aware of any political crimes in the area assigned to them and to secure evidence leading to the arrest and punishment of the criminals. It is the task of other junior officers in the interrogation section to obtain a signed deposition from each prisoner confessing to his crimes.

In the following sections the various steps of the procedure used by the KGB will be outlined. The Communist principle which is the ostensible reason for using each step in the procedure will be discussed. This will be followed by a description of the procedure as it is actually carried out.

3. The Suspect

Those who fall under the suspicion of the KGB usually have some reason for exciting its suspicion. To the victim himself, such suspicion may appear to be capricious or arbitrary because he may be utterly unaware of the basis for it. The Russian definition of "crimes against the state," or political crimes, is a broad one, and the interpretation of these Russian laws is largely in the hands of the KGB; for all practical purposes, it may find reason to suspect anyone. From long practice this organization has developed the thesis that those who conspire against the state will fall into recognized categories. First of all, there are those members of the Communist Party who have come under suspicion by the Party apparatus, or who have been criticized for failure in some activity. Since "the Party can do no wrong," failure may become the equivalent of sabotage or treason. Second, there are those who have traveled abroad or who have had association with foreigners. This, of course, includes all foreigners; but it also includes former prisoners of war, Soviet functionaries who have served abroad, and even members of the KGB itself. Third, members of certain Soviet nationalities which are suspected of nationalist aspirations may also be suspected as a group. The Volga Germans and the Chichen-Ingush are examples. The most recent example was the suspicion cast upon all Jews during the period from 1950 to 1952, when complaints of "cosmopolitanism" were being made against this group. Fourth, certain segments of Soviet society, such as the "Kulaks" of the early 1930's or the Army in 1937-1939, may be suspect. Fifth, there are those whose class origin is considered bourgeois or aristocratic. These are fewer in number than they used to be, but they formerly constituted a large group of natural suspects. In times of unrest or mass hysteria, such as occurred during

the purge trials or during World War II, all persons in a category may become "suspects" and subject to arrest.

In addition to these "general suspects," there are "specific suspects," who become such either because suspicion has been cast upon them by one of the many informers among the general population or because they are relatives, friends, or former associates of other persons who have been arrested or are suspected. Other specific suspects are those who either intentionally or unintentionally have made statements, or carried out acts, which the police regard as evidence of criminal, antistate activity.

The following general assumptions can be made:

1. Although the suspect may not know why he is suspected, the KGB has some reason for singling him out.

2. Because of the broad nature of Soviet laws, and the free manner in which the KGB can interpret these, any "suspect" has committed some "crime against the state" as the KGB defines the term.

The implications of this statement are significant. In a nation in which the state owns all property, where everyone works for the state, and where only approved opinions may be held, a person who has accidentally broken or lost some of the "people's property," who has made a mistake, who has not worked hard enough, who has talked to a foreigner, or who has merely expressed what he inferred was an innocent opinion, may be *ipso facto* guilty of a "crime against the state."

Thus, those who fall into the various categories of "natural suspects" constitute a reservoir of potential victims for the secret police. A person who belongs to one of these groups may go unmolested for a long period. His arrest, when it ultimately takes place, will occur when the KGB needs arrests. For example, when party policy decrees that there shall be a widespread campaign against "foreign spies," the KGB will seek its victims from those whom it regards as potential foreign agents. If the Party decides upon a campaign against nationalist tendencies among Soviet citizens, the KGB will select its victims from the nationality which has been singled out as an "example." If there is a struggle for power within the Party hierarchy, the victims of the KGB will be selected from those members of the Party who lose out in the struggle. Sometimes purely bureaucratic needs within the secret police organization are the occasion for arrest. Since the effectiveness of the organization in the various districts is judged by the number of arrests and convictions obtained, when the leader of a district fears that his organization is falling behind, he will generate local pressures for more arrests; the victims, of course, will be selected from appropriate groups of suspects. The result of all of this is that many of the victims of the secret police apparatus are seized for reasons quite beyond their own control, which are not immediately related to anything that they may have done.

4. The Accumulation of Evidence

It is an administrative principle of the Soviet government that no one may be arrested unless there is evidence that he is a criminal.

According to the practice of the KGB this means that when a man falls under the suspicion of a KGB officer, this officer must accumulate "evidence" that the man is a "criminal" and take this evidence to the state prosecutor,

who must then issue a warrant before the arrest can be carried out. When a man falls under the suspicion of the KGB, an officer in the investigation section draws up a plan for the investigation of his case. The plan describes why the man is suspected, who are his suspected associates, what evidence is needed to arrest him, how he shall be placed under surveillance, how the evidence shall be gathered, and how he shall be arrested. This plan is submitted to his superiors for comment, criticism, and approval, and is then put into action. The investigating officer accumulates "evidence" by showing that the victim had a reason to be a criminal (i.e., that he was a member of a suspect group) and by accumulating the statements of spies and informers with regard to him. If this "evidence" is not sufficient to satisfy the officer, he places the suspect and the suspect's friends and associates under surveillance. These friends and associates may be held for interrogation in order to supply evidence against the suspect, the reason for their seizure being that they are associates of a suspect, and therefore suspect themselves.

Covert surveillance and the arrest of associates are carried out carefully, but they cannot always be concealed from the suspect. He may become aware of it, or his friends may tell him. As he comes a marked man in the eyes of his friends, they begin to avoid him. Their demeanor sometimes indicates to him that he is under suspicion. The knowledge that he will be arrested, without knowledge of when this will occur, obviously creates anxiety in the intended victim. Although KGB officers know about the psychological effect which surveillance has upon suspects, and make use of it, they do not use it with the calculated cunning that the victim sometimes supposes. Poorly concealed surveillance, and the arrest of friends and associates, followed after an indefinite period by the arrest of the main suspect, are not necessarily stage maneuvers to frighten the victim. Often they are simply evidence of rather slow and clumsy police activities.

The investigating officer in charge of the "case" is usually not above the rank of major. His standing in the eyes of his superiors and his future career in the organization are dependent upon his ability to achieve arrest and convictions. His superiors themselves have a similar relation to their superiors. Thus it often happens, especially in times of internal tension, that members of the organization compete with one another in trying to turn up suspects and secure their conviction. To a certain extent, officers are judged by the number of arrests which they obtain. Since Communist legal principles demand that no person be arrested except when it is clear that he is a criminal, officers who arrest men who must later be released are subject to censure. They have made a mistake because they have arrested a man who is not a criminal.

The consequences are important from the point of view of the victim. In effect, any man who is arrested is automatically in the position of being "guilty".†

If the "evidence" should be insufficient to substantiate his guilt, those in charge of his case are subject to censure. In theory, those making the arrest should have accumulated beforehand sufficient evidence of guilt to satisfy both their superior officers and the state prosecutor. It is usually not difficult to satisfy these officials. Nevertheless, this requirement for sufficient evidence of guilt puts pressure upon the junior officers of the KGB, who are anxious

† A discussion of the Communist concept of "guilt" and the meaning of this term to the KGB is presented in Part II, Section 16.

to establish a reputation for themselves, and sometimes they may falsify the "evidence" which they present to the prosecutor. This is a forbidden practice, for which the offending officer could be punished if he were "officially" found out. The officers who took part in staging the famous "doctor's plot" of 1952 were punished later for "falsifying the evidence." But when the KGB is under pressure to secure convictions, and when this pressure comes from high in the Party, "falsification of evidence," like the use of physical brutality in obtaining confessions, may be a widespread procedure. It is never "officially" condoned.

Anyone arrested by the KGB must know that in the eyes of the Soviet state, and in the eyes of those who have arrested him, he is a "criminal." The only question to be settled after his arrest is the extent of his criminal activity and the precise nature of his crimes. The officers in charge of his case, both those who have made the arrest and those who will carry out the interrogation, have a personal interest in seeing that the arrested man makes a prompt and extensive confession, for their own reputations are at stake. These officers work on a "time table": They are expected to "settle the case" within six weeks to three months after their victim has been seized by producing a satisfactory protocol, upon which a "trial" can be based.

5. The Arrest Procedure

It is a Communist principle that men should be arrested in a manner which will not cause them embarrassment and that the police should carry out arrests in a manner which will not unduly disturb the population.

In the United States, it is said that a man is "arrested" when the police seize him, detain him, or otherwise deprive him of his freedom; and United States law requires that the police obtain a "warrant" or comply with certain other legal procedures before carrying out an arrest. In the Soviet Union the KGB may obtain a "warrant" from the state prosecutor before seizing a man, but it is not required to do so. It may "detain" a man on suspicion and interrogate him "to see if he is a criminal." What would be called "arrest" in the United States may be carried out in the Soviet Union with or without a warrant. The process of seizure is the same in either case.

For more than 20 years it has been the practice of the Russian State Police to seize their suspects in the middle of the night. The "midnight knock on the door" has become a standard episode in fiction about Russia. The police are well aware of the fact that the intended victim, forewarned by his previous surveillance and the changing attitude of his friends, is further terrified by the thought that he may be awakened from his sleep almost any night and taken away. The official explanation for the nighttime arrests is that such a procedure avoids the embarrassment and alarm which would be created if the victim were seized in the daytime. It is customary for the arresting officer to be accompanied by several other men. He usually reads to the prisoner the arrest warrant, if there is one. It does not, of course, specify the details of the crimes committed. The prisoner is then taken promptly to a detention prison.

An alternate method of arrest, for which the same official explanation is given, is to carry out the procedure in a city not the home of the suspect. In order to accomplish this, men under suspicion are ordered by their superiors to travel on some pretext or other. Before the victim reaches his destination, he is arrested and taken from the train. A third method, said to be preferred

when there is no warrant, is to seize the victim suddenly as he walks down the street. All of these procedures create intense anxiety in the victim, and in the population at large they create all of the alarm which may be generated by the sudden and unexplained disappearance of a person from the midst of his family and friends.

6. The Detention Prison

According to Soviet administrative principle, a man who is arrested by the state police is not "imprisoned." He is merely "detained." In theory, he is detained in a quiet, healthy atmosphere, where he has an opportunity to meditate upon his crimes, and a chance to talk them over freely and at length with police officers, without being prejudiced by friends, associates, or lawyers, who might induce him to distort the truth.

In most of the large cities of the Soviet Union the KGB operates detention prisons. These prisons contain only persons under "investigation," whose cases have not yet been "settled." The most modern of these prisons are separate institutions, well built and spotlessly clean. In addition to the cells for the prisoners, they contain offices for the KGB units, rooms in which interrogations are carried out, and other rooms, usually in the basement, in which prisoners are executed when such punishment is decided upon. There are attached medical facilities and rooms for the care of the sick detainees. An exercise yard is a standard facility. In outlying areas or undeveloped regions, the KGB may occupy a separate wing of a general prison and use this as a detention prison. Facilities in these areas may be ancient or inadequate, depending upon what is available; but the detention wing itself is administered separately from that of the rest of the prison, and prisoners under detention are segregated from general prisoners.

Most of the cells in Soviet detention prisons are designed for one occupant. The typical cell is a small cubicle, about 10 ft. long by 6 ft. wide, containing a single bunk and a slop jar. It usually has no other furnishings. Its walls are barren, and it is lighted by a single electric lamp in the ceiling. One wall usually contains a small window above eye level, from which the prisoner can see nothing of his outside environment. The door contains a peephole, through which the guard in the corridor outside may observe the prisoner at will without the prisoner's knowledge.

There also may be cells which are large enough to hold two or more prisoners. Except for size, such cells are not different from the others. In general, prisoners whose cases are relatively unimportant, those against whom the evidence is "complete," and those who have indicated a willingness to talk freely are placed in cells with other prisoners, some of whom are usually informers. Those whose cases are important or "incomplete," those from whom information is desired, and those for whom public trials or propaganda confessions are planned are put in solitary confinement.

Such typical cells will not, of course, be found in all prisons, and especially not in those which are old or improvised; but the general aspect of barrenness and complete lack of access to the outside world is characteristic.

7. The Regimen Within the Detention Prison

The arresting officers usually do not give the prisoner any reason for his arrest beyond that in the warrant which they read to him. They usually search

him, and also search the place in which he lives. They then take him directly to the prison. Here he is asked a few questions about his identity, and his personal valuables and outer clothing are taken from him. These are carefully catalogued and put away.[‡] He may or may not be given a prison uniform. He is usually examined by a prison physician shortly after his incarceration.

The entire introduction to the detention prison is brief and is carried on without explanation. Within a few hours after his arrest the prisoner finds himself locked up within a cell.

An almost invariable feature of the management of any important suspect under detention is a period of total isolation in a detention cell. The prisoner is placed within his cell; the door is shut, and for an indefinite period he is totally isolated from human contact except by the specific direction of the officer in charge of his case. He is not allowed to talk to the guards or to communicate with other prisoners in any manner. When he is taken from his cell for any reason, he is accompanied by a guard. If another prisoner approaches through the corridor, he turns his face to the wall until the other prisoner has passed.

The hours and routine of the prisoner are rigidly organized. He is awakened early in the morning and given a short period in which to wash himself. His food is brought to him. He has a short and fixed time in which to eat it; the standard diet is just adequate to maintain nutrition. He must clean himself and police his own cell; but he is not allowed enough time to keep it spotlessly clean. At some time in the morning he usually has an exercise period. Typically, his exercise consists of walking alone in the exercise yard. If he is in rigid isolation, he may not be allowed to exercise at all. He is usually allowed a slop jar in his cell which he can utilize for defecation and urination, but sometimes this is taken away. Then he must call the guard and perhaps wait for hours to be taken to the latrine.

At all times except when he is eating, sleeping, exercising, or being interrogated, the prisoner is left strictly alone in his cell. He has nothing to do, nothing to read, and no one to talk to. Under the strictest regimen, he may have to sit or stand in his cell in a fixed position all day. He may sleep only at hours prescribed for sleep. Then he must go to bed promptly when told, and must lie in a fixed position upon his back with his hands outside the blanket. If he deviates from this position, the guard outside will awaken him and make him resume it. The light in his cell burns constantly. He must sleep with his face constantly toward it.

If the prisoner becomes ill, he is taken to a prison physician, by whom he is treated with the best medical care available, according to the practices common to Soviet medicine. If necessary, he may be placed under hospital care; but as soon as he has recovered, the regimen will be resumed.

Prisoners who attempt to commit suicide are thwarted and carefully nursed until they recover; then the regimen is resumed.

Deviations from the prescribed regimen are promptly noticed by the guards and are punished. Disturbed behavior is punished also. If this behavior persists

[‡] It is an interesting comment on the "legalistic" behavior of the KGB that prisoners who have been detained, interrogated, tortured, imprisoned at length, and ultimately released after many years may then receive all of their original clothing and personal valuables, which have been scrupulously cared for during their imprisonment.

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

and the officer in charge of the case is convinced that the prisoner has become mentally ill, the man may be placed under medical care until his health has returned; then the regimen is resumed.

8. Effects of the Regimen in the Isolation Cell

The effects upon prisoners of the regimen in the isolation cell are striking.§ It has been mentioned that the man who has been arrested by the KGB is usually intensely apprehensive. Often he has known for weeks that he would be arrested, but has had no clear knowledge of when, or for what reason. He has been seized in the middle of the night and taken without explanation to a formidable prison. He knows that no friend can help him, and that the KGB may do with him what they please.

A major aspect of his prison experience is isolation. Man is a social animal; he does not live alone. From birth to death he lives in the company of his fellow men. When he is totally isolated, he is removed from all of the interpersonal relations which are so important to him, and taken out of the social role which sustains him. His internal as well as his external life is disrupted. Exposed for the first time to total isolation in a KGB prison, he develops a predictable group of symptoms, which might almost be called a "disease syndrome." The guards and KGB officers are quite familiar with this syndrome. They watch each new prisoner with technical interest as his symptoms develop.

The initial appearance of an arrested prisoner is one of bewilderment. For a few hours he may sit quietly in his cell looking confused and dejected. But within a short time most prisoners become alert and begin to take an interest in their environment. They react with expectancy when anyone approaches the door to the cell. They show interest and anxiety as they are exposed to each new feature of the prison routine. They may ask questions or begin conversations. Some make demands: They demand to know why they are being held and protest that they are innocent. If they are foreign nationals, they may insist upon seeing their consular officers. Some take a "You can't do this to me" attitude. Some pass through a brief period of shouting, threatening, and demanding. All of this is always sternly repressed. If need be, the officer in charge of the case will see the prisoner, remind him of the routine, threaten him with punishment, and punish him if he does not subside.|| During this period the prisoner has not yet appreciated the full import of his situation. He tries to fraternize with the guards. He leaves part of his food if he does not like it. He tries to speak to prisoners whom he passes in the corridors and reaches back to close the door behind him when he is taken to the latrine. The guards refer to this as the period of getting "acclimatized" to the prison routine.

After a few days it becomes apparent to the prisoner that his activity avails

§ The reaction to be described in this and in the following sections is that of a "typical" man, previously untrained, who has never been imprisoned or isolated before, and who has been arrested for a serious, but not specified, crime against the state of which he could be "guilty." Even among such men, there are wide differences in the capacity to tolerate the isolation regimen. Some become demoralized within a few days, while others are able to retain a high degree of self-control for months. In addition to this, most men possess the capacity to adapt to isolation, and those who experience the isolation regimen a second time almost always tolerate it better, and longer. Previous training and the circumstances of seizure are important also.

|| The punishments used are described in Sections 10 and 13.

him nothing, and that he will be punished or reprimanded for even the smallest breaches of the routine. He wonders when he will be released or questioned. His requests have been listened to but never acted upon. He becomes increasingly anxious and restless, and his sleep is disturbed. He begins to look up alertly when anyone passes in the corridor. He jumps when the guard comes to the door. He becomes "adjusted" to the routine in his cell and goes through it punctiliously; but he still leaves some of his food, and occasionally he reveals by small gestures his lack of complete submission to his environment.

The period of anxiety, hyperactivity, and apparent adjustment to the isolation routine usually continues from one to three weeks. As it continues, the prisoner becomes increasingly dejected and dependent. He gradually gives up all spontaneous activity within his cell and ceases to care about his personal appearance and actions. Finally, he sits and stares with a vacant expression, perhaps endlessly twisting a button on his coat. He allows himself to become dirty and disheveled. When food is presented to him, he eats it all, but he no longer bothers with the niceties of eating. He may mix it into a mush and stuff it into his mouth like an animal. He goes through the motions of his prison routine automatically, as if he were in a daze. The slop jar is no longer offensive to him. Ultimately he seems to lose many of the restraints of ordinary behavior. He may soil himself. He weeps; he mutters, and he prays aloud in his cell. He follows the orders of the guard with the docility of a trained animal. It usually takes from four to six weeks to produce this phenomenon in a newly imprisoned man.

9. The Feelings and Attitudes of the Prisoner During the Isolation Regimen

The man who for the first time experiences isolation in prison is, of course, experiencing far more than simple isolation. He usually feels profoundly anxious, helpless, frustrated, dejected, and entirely uncertain about his future. His initial reaction to the isolation procedure is indeed one of bewilderment and some numbness at the calamity which has befallen him. This is followed by a period of interest and apprehension about every detail of the prison regimen, accompanied by hope that he can explain everything as soon as he gets a chance, or an expectation that he will be released when the proper authorities hear about his plight. Such hopes last but a few days, but they keep him alert and interested during that time.

As hope disappears, a reaction of anxious waiting supervenes. In this period, the profound boredom and complete loneliness of his situation gradually overwhelm the prisoner. There is literally nothing for him to do except ruminate, and because he has so much to worry about, his ruminations are seldom pleasant. Frequently, they take the form of going over and over all the possible causes for his arrest. His mood becomes one of dejection. His sleep is disturbed by nightmares. Ultimately he may reach a state of depression in which he ceases to care about his personal appearance and behavior and pays little attention to his surroundings. In this state the prisoner may have illusory experiences. A distant sound in the corridor sounds like someone calling his name. The rattle of a footstep may be interpreted as a key in the lock opening the cell.

Some prisoners may become delirious and have visual hallucinations. God may seem to appear to such a prisoner and tell him to cooperate with his

interrogator. He may see his wife standing beside him, or a servant bringing him a large meal. In nearly all cases the prisoner's need for human companionship and his desire to talk to anyone about anything becomes a gnawing appetite, which may be as insistent as the hunger of a starving man. If he is given an opportunity to talk, he may say anything which seems to be appropriate, or to be desired by his listener, for in his confused and befuddled state he may be unable to tell what is "actually true" from what "might be" or "should be" true. He may be highly suggestible, and he may "confabulate" the details of any story suggested to him.

Not all men who first experience total isolation react in precisely this manner. In some, these symptoms are less conspicuous. In others, dejection and utter despondence set in earlier, or later. Still others, and especially those with pre-existing personality disturbances, may become frankly psychotic. However, frank psychotic manifestations, other than those of the "prison psychosis" described above, are not usual, primarily because those having charge of the prisoners usually break the routine of total isolation when they see that disorganization of the prisoner's personality is imminent.

10. Other Pressures of the Isolation Regimen

Not all of the reaction to this imprisonment experience can be attributed to isolation alone. Other potent forces are acting upon the newly imprisoned man. The prisoner's *anxiety* about himself is compounded by worry about what may happen to his friends and associates, and, in the case of those who possess information which they wish to hide, apprehension about how much the KGB knows or will find out. Even in the absence of isolation, profound and uncontrolled anxiety is disorganizing. *Uncertainty* compounds his anxiety also. The newly arrested prisoner does not know how long he will be confined, how he will be punished, or with what he will be charged. He does know that his punishment may be anything up to death or permanent imprisonment. Many prisoners say that uncertainty is the most unbearable aspect of the whole experience. *Sleep disturbances* and nightmares lead to further fear and fatigue.

The effects of isolation, uncertainty, and anxiety are usually sufficient to make the prisoner eager to talk to his interrogator and to seek some method of escape from a situation which has become intolerable. But, if these alone are not enough to produce the desired effect, the officer in charge has other simple and highly effective ways of applying pressure. Two of the most effective of these are *fatigue* and *lack of sleep*. The constant light in the cell and the necessity of maintaining a rigid position in bed compound the effects of anxiety and nightmares in producing sleep disturbances. If these are not enough, it is easy to have the guards awaken the prisoner at intervals. This is especially effective if the prisoner is always awakened as soon as he drops off to sleep. The guards can also shorten the hours available for sleep, or deny sleep altogether. Continued loss of sleep produces clouding of consciousness and a loss of alertness (both of which impair the victim's ability to sustain isolation. It also produces profound fatigue.

Another simple and effective type of pressure is that of maintaining the *temperature of the cell* at a level which is either too hot or too cold for comfort. Continuous heat, at a level at which constant sweating is necessary in order to maintain body temperature, is enervating and fatigue-producing. Sustained cold

is uncomfortable and poorly tolerated. Yet another method of creating pressure is to reduce the food ration to the point at which the prisoner is constantly hungry. This usually involves loss of weight, which is often associated with weakness and asthenia. Furthermore, *deprivation of food* produces lassitude, loss of general interest, and some breakdown of courage. Some people become profoundly depressed when deprived of food. Chronically hungry people can sometimes be induced to overcome a surprising number of their inhibitions in order to relieve their hunger.

The effects of isolation, anxiety, fatigue, lack of sleep, uncomfortable temperatures, and chronic hunger produce disturbances of mood, attitudes, and behavior in nearly all prisoners. The living organism cannot entirely withstand such assaults. The Communists do not look upon these assaults as "torture." Undoubtedly, they use the methods which they do in order to conform, in a typical legalistic manner, to overt Communist principles, which demand that "no force or torture be used in extracting information from prisoners." But all of them produce great discomfort, and lead to serious disturbances of many bodily processes; there is no reason to differentiate them from any other form of torture.

11. The Interrogator

The KGB officer who has charge of a case during the period of suspicion, surveillance, and arrest is now supplanted by another officer who is charged with the interrogation of the prisoner and the preparation of the deposition. (Prisoners commonly refer to this document as the "confession"). The officers who specialize in interrogation are relatively junior also; they come from a generation which has grown up under the Communist regime and are selected for the KGB in part because of their evident devotion to the Party and its program. The majority are first recruited from the ranks of the armed services, or the Komsomol. They are usually chosen on the basis of demonstrated Party loyalty and a "horseback opinion" of their aptitude for KGB work. Nearly all of them have had the equivalent of a secondary school education, and some have had more schooling. Many of them are ardent Party members, with an almost religious dedication to the organization.

Within the KGB, assignments to interrogation are not highly regarded. Most KGB officers prefer to go into offensive espionage or join paramilitary units. Relatively few of them wish to become involved in political counterespionage, investigation, and interrogation. Such work is not looked upon as glamorous or exciting. Very often it involves assignment to outlying and relatively dull regions of the Soviet Union, and usually is hard and thankless. The interrogation of prisoners is a tiring and an emotionally trying procedure. Thus, there is often a deficiency of applicants for work in this section of the secret police, and local district officers of the KGB must assign men to fill the necessary quota at the state police school. The assignment is often given to the least desirable men in the organization. It can be assumed that a majority of those involved in the investigation and interrogation of unimportant prisoners are men of average ability with no great enthusiasm for their job. However, the KGB does also possess highly skilled, well-educated, extremely knowledgeable, experienced, and able interrogators who are devoted to their profession and proud of their abilities. The interrogator assigned to an important prisoner can be expected to be a man of such high caliber.

Some of those who go into secret police activity receive only a sort of "on-the-job" training under the guidance of more senior and experienced men, but a fair proportion of these police officers are especially trained at a KGB school. The course in the conduct of interrogations includes a description of the various interrogation methods that will be discussed shortly. Trainees are allowed to observe a demonstration interrogation, but do not actually conduct interrogations themselves. No formal training in psychology, psychiatry, pharmacology, or physiology is included in the curriculum. There are no representatives of any of these sciences on the faculty and, as far as we have been able to ascertain, there never have been. Trainees do receive information from experienced police officers on how to prepare a dossier, how to "size up" a man, and how to estimate what sort of methods to use in "breaking" him; but the instructors draw entirely upon police experience. They have a contempt for theoretical psychiatry and psychology, and for instruments such as the polygraph, which most of them regard as a useless gadget.

12. Interrogation

When the prisoner has been arrested and incarcerated in his cell, the officer in charge of his case submits to his superiors a plan for the interrogation of the prisoner. This plan is drawn up on the basis of what is already known about the prisoner. It describes the methods to be used upon him, the attitudes to be taken toward him, the type of crimes which he is believed to have committed, and the assumed motivation for them. His superiors may criticize or comment upon this plan and offer added suggestions, based upon their own experience. The purpose of this plan appears to be primarily that of making the interrogator approach the prisoner with a definite conception of what he wants to do and how he is going to proceed in doing it. The plan need not be adhered to rigidly if the development of the case indicates that changes should be made. In some prisons the interrogator reviews the plan with his superiors after each session and describes to them how he intends to conduct the next session.

If a prisoner indicates at the time he is seized that he is aware of his guilt and is prepared to describe his crimes, the interrogator may begin to question him very soon after his imprisonment. This is true especially when the police already possess a great deal of "evidence" and the prisoner readily confesses to the "crimes" which the interrogator wishes to establish.

Likewise, if the prisoner is seized without a warrant, the interrogator is likely to begin the questioning early. Soviet law specifies that if a man is "detained on suspicion" the first protocol of his interrogation must be given to the state prosecutor within 10 days, so that an arrest warrant may be issued or the man may be released. In general, interrogators are constrained to comply with this regulation, and they try to produce enough evidence to obtain an arrest within 10 days. In many such cases, because they have little except suspicion to guide their questioning, they are necessarily vague in describing the prisoner's crimes to him. They must be cautious lest the prisoner get wind of what they want him to say and refuse to say it. It is probably this, more than any calculated cunning, which causes them to make to the prisoner such enigmatic statements as, "It is not up to me to tell you what your crimes are; it is up to you to tell me"—statements which lead the perplexed prisoner to rack his brain for an answer. The prosecutor is not hard to satisfy, and the interrogator nearly always obtains enough evidence to make an "arrest." If not, he can apply for an extension of

the detention period. The law provides no real protection for the prisoner.

Interrogations, once begun, are continued until "the case is complete," but in some circumstances they are intentionally delayed in their onset. It appears that his delay is imposed when the prisoner is defiant, when he is thought to be withholding information, when the KGB is seeking a confession to crimes other than those for which it has "evidence," and especially when it wants to use the prisoner for a public trial or to obtain a propaganda confession from him. In such cases, the interrogation begins when the officer in charge feels that the prisoner is ripe for it. This is usually when he observes that the prisoner has become docile and compliant and shows evidence of deterioration in his mood and personal appearance.

Interrogations are almost uniformly carried out at night. It is said that this practice of night interrogation originated not from any preconceived idea of its effectiveness, but because the early Chekists were so overburdened with police duties during the day that they could find time for interrogations only at night. For one reason or another, it has become standard procedure, possibly because the physical and psychological effects of night interrogations produce added pressure upon the prisoner. He is deprived of sleep, and placed in a state of added uncertainty by never knowing when he will be awakened and questioned. Typically, he will be awakened suddenly by the guard shortly after he has dropped off to sleep. Without explanation, he is taken from his cell and down several corridors to a small and barren interrogation room, equipped with a desk and chair for the interrogator and a stool for the prisoner. The lighting is arranged so that the prisoner can be placed in a bright light, while the interrogator sits in relative darkness. Sometimes a stenographer is present in one corner of the room to take notes. More frequently the interrogator makes his own notes, writing as the prisoner speaks. Usually only one interrogator is present, but occasionally other officers are introduced. Sometimes interrogators alternate, for psychological reasons, one being "friendly" and the other "hostile." If his work is successful, the original interrogator may carry the case through to a conclusion; but if he does not achieve the desired goal, he may be removed, and a new officer takes over the interrogation.

The atmosphere of the interrogation room generally has some degree of formality about it. The interrogator may be dressed in full uniform. If he wishes to impress the prisoner, he may take out a pistol, cock it, and lay it on the desk before him; but this psychological gambit does not seem to be a required part of the protocol. The interrogator adjusts his attitude toward the prisoner according to his estimate of the kind of man he is facing. If the dossier indicates that the prisoner is a timid and fearful man, the interrogator may adopt a fierce and threatening demeanor. If the prisoner is thought to be proud and sensitive, the interrogator may be insulting and degrading. If the prisoner has been a man of prestige and importance in private life, the interrogator may call him by his first name, treat him as an inferior, and remind him that he has lost all rank and privilege. If the prisoner is thought to be suggestible, the interrogator will try to influence him by suggestion. If the prisoner is known as venal and self-seeking, the interrogator may try to bribe him with promises of reward for cooperation. If the prisoner has a tendency to blame others, the interrogator may try to let him place the blame upon others, while describing his own activities as harmless. If the prisoner is known to have a wife and children for whom he

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

cares deeply, the interrogator may threaten harm to them if the prisoner does not cooperate, and promise to protect and help them if he does. If it is known that the prisoner has been unfaithful to his wife or has committed some crime, such as embezzlement, the interrogator may blackmail him by threatening exposure or punishment unless he cooperates. All these, and many other tricks, may be employed. They are not based upon a scientific theory of human behavior; they are tricks of the trade, so to speak, developed out of police experience and applied on a "rule-of-thumb," "common-sense" basis.

Almost invariably the interrogator takes the attitude that the prisoner is guilty and acts as though all of his crimes were known. Almost invariably he points out to the prisoner that he is completely helpless and that there is no hope for him unless he cooperates fully and confesses his crimes completely. Almost never does the interrogator state specifically what the prisoner's crimes actually are. This is left up to the prisoner, who is told, in effect, that he knows the extent of his own crimes and need only make a complete statement of them.

Almost invariably the interrogator does not accept the early statement of the prisoner. No matter what crimes he confesses, the interrogator forces the prisoner to repeat his statements again and again, and to elaborate on them endlessly. Almost always he uses any discrepancies as indications of lying and questions the prisoner at length about them.

The first interrogation sessions are nearly always concerned with a complete review of the entire life experience of the prisoner. The interrogator wishes to know about the prisoner's background; his class origin; his parents, brothers, and sisters; his friends and associates, and everything that he has done throughout his life. If the case is of any importance, no detail is overlooked, and every period of the prisoner's life must be accounted for.

This review of the prisoner's life may occupy several interrogation sessions. It has several purposes. The primary one is to complete the prisoner's dossier. It gives the interrogator a thorough picture of the type of man he is dealing with and further guides him to the man's weaknesses, which can be exploited. Furthermore, requiring a man to account for every detail of his life produces a voluminous and involved story, and the prisoner can scarcely avoid being trapped into inconsistencies if he is concealing anything. The information obtained from the life history can be compared with that already in the police files, which are usually extensive. It enables the police to know the associates of the prisoner—information which is important, because these may be his "accomplices in crime," who can be made suspects also, and interrogated for further information. Perhaps its most important purpose is that it reveals many "criminal" features of the prisoner, such as "reactionary class origin," "membership in reactionary organizations," and "association with enemies of the state," which are, by Communist definition, "crimes" no matter how long ago they were "committed."

The prisoner, taken from his cell after a long period of isolation, anxiety, and despair, usually looks upon the first interrogation as a welcome break. The mere opportunity to talk to someone is intensely gratifying. Many prisoners have reported that after long periods of isolation they eagerly anticipate interrogation sessions and try to prolong them simply for the companionship which they afford. Not infrequently the prisoner also regards interrogation as an opportunity to justify himself, and feels a false assurance that he can "explain everything" as soon as he is given a chance.

Usually he is much taken aback by the fact that his crimes are not specified and that his guilt is assured. He is further distressed when his protestations of innocence are greeted as lies. But the opportunity to talk about his life experiences is generally looked upon, especially by a person from Western society, as an opportunity to justify his behavior. Many men willingly divulge all that they can remember about themselves, because they feel quite sure that they have done nothing which may be regarded as criminal. They are unaware that, from the point of view of Communist theory and of the KGB, much of their past behavior undoubtedly will be construed as "criminal" and held against them. If the interrogator offers them the opportunity to have paper and pencil in their cells and to write out their biographies, they seize upon this avidly as a means of relieving the boredom of the tedious, lonely routine to which they are exposed.

13. Pressures Applied by the Interrogator

As the interrogation proceeds, the interrogator changes his behavior according to his previous plan and the development of the case. If the prisoner is cooperating and talking freely, the interrogator continues to show a relatively friendly attitude. But sooner or later he invariably expresses dissatisfaction with the information which the prisoner has given, no matter how complete it may be. He demands new details, and usually shows an especially great interest in the "accomplices" of the prisoner and the "organization" to which he is supposed to have been attached. When the prisoner protests that he has told all, and denies any other crimes or accomplices, the interrogator becomes hostile and begins to apply pressure.

Some of the pressures which can be applied simply by altering the routine within the cell have been described. The interrogator has many others at his command. Continuous and repetitive interrogation is an effective and very common form of pressure. Another which is widely used is that of requiring the prisoner to stand throughout the interrogation session or to maintain some other physical position which becomes painful. This, like other features of the KGB procedure, is a form of physical torture, in spite of the fact that the prisoners and KGB officers alike do not ordinarily perceive it as such. Any fixed position which is maintained over a long period of time ultimately produces excruciating pain. Certain positions, of which the standing position is one, also produce impairment of the circulation. Many men can withstand the pain of long standing, but sooner or later all men succumb to the circulatory failure it produces. After 18 to 24 hours of continuous standing, there is an accumulation of fluid in the tissues of the legs. This dependent edema is produced by the extravasation of fluid from the blood vessels. The ankles and feet of the prisoner swell to twice their normal circumference. The edema may rise up the legs as high as the middle of the thighs. The skin becomes tense and intensely painful. Large blisters develop, which break and exude watery serum. The accumulation of the body fluid in the legs produces impairment of the circulation. The heart rate increases, and fainting may occur. Eventually, there is a renal shutdown, and urine production ceases. Urea and other metabolites accumulate in the blood. The prisoner becomes thirsty and may drink a good deal of water, which is not excreted but adds to the edema of his legs. Men have been known to remain standing for periods as long as several days. Ultimately they usually develop a delirious state, characterized by disorientation, fear, delusions, and visual hallu-

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

cinations. This psychosis is produced by a combination of circulatory impairment, lack of sleep, and uremia.

Periods of long standing are usually interrupted from time to time by interrogation periods, during which the interrogator demands and threatens, while pointing out to the prisoner that it would be easy for him to end his misery merely by cooperating.

The KGB hardly ever uses manacles or chains, and rarely resorts to physical beatings. The actual physical beating is, of course, repugnant to overt Communist principles, and is contrary to KGB regulations also. The ostensible reason for these regulations is that they are contrary to Communist principles. The practical reason for them is the fact that the KGB looks upon direct physical brutality as an ineffective method of obtaining the compliance of the prisoner. Its opinion in this regard is shared by police in other parts of the world. In general, direct physical brutality creates only resentment, hostility, further defiance, and unreliable statements.

It is a general policy that the interrogator must obtain the written permission of his superiors before using extreme coercive measures of any sort upon prisoners. In actual practice such permission is sought only if the officer in charge of a case feels that there is a need for a direct brutal assault. The KGB recognizes that some men who are intensely afraid of physical assault may break down if beaten once or twice, and it does use this procedure deliberately, though uncommonly. Generally speaking, when an interrogator strikes a prisoner in anger, he does so "unofficially." The act may be a true expression of his exasperation, and evidence that he, himself, is under emotional strain.

The use of brutality in the Russian secret police waxes and wanes in cycles that recur throughout the years. When feelings of insecurity develop within those holding power, they become increasingly suspicious and put great pressures upon the secret police to obtain arrests and confessions. At such times police officials are inclined to condone anything which produces a speedy "confession," and brutality may become widespread. Later, when the Party leadership again feels secure, its suspiciousness subsides. Meanwhile, demands arise for "reform," and the cessation of "irregular practices" by the secret police. Soon stern orders are issued that prisoners shall not be subjected to brutality, and some unfortunate police officers are punished for their past behavior. After this, brutality will be scrupulously avoided until the next wave of suspicion arises.

Regardless of brutality, it can be taken for granted that some period of intense pressure and coercion will be applied to every prisoner, no matter how cooperative he tries to be at first. This period of pressure will be accompanied by expressions of displeasure and hostility from the interrogator, and sometimes from the guards also. It appears to be a working principle of the KGB that no man ever reveals everything voluntarily. It has been a universal experience of prisoners of Communist state police that no matter how much a man tells, he is always pressed to tell more—in fact, those who talk are often the ones who are hounded the longest. Men who immediately, and without pressure, volunteer all that they know do not thus allay the suspicions of their interrogator. Eventually, when their flow of information runs out, and persuasion yields no more, they find themselves put through the same routine of repetitive torture which more recalcitrant prisoners encounter.

14. The "Friendly Approach"

The interrogator will continue this pressure until he feels that the prisoner is nearly at the end of his rope. At this point he introduces a psychological gambit which is probably the most successful of any of the tricks at his command. He suddenly changes his demeanor. The prisoner, returned once again to an interrogation session that he expects will be a repetition of torture and villification, suddenly finds that the entire scene has changed. The interrogation room is brightly lighted. The interrogator is seated behind his desk, relaxed and smiling. Tea and cigarettes are waiting on the table. He is ushered to a comfortable chair. The guard is sent away, and sometimes the secretary also. The interrogator remarks about his appearance. He is sympathetic about the discomfort which he has been suffering. He is sorry that the prisoner has had such a difficult time. The interrogator himself would not have wished to do this to the prisoner—it is only that the prison regulations require this treatment, because of the prisoner's own stubbornness. "But let us relax and be friends. Let us not talk any more about crimes. Tell me about your family"—and so on. The usual line is to the effect that, "After all, I am a reasonable man. I want to get this business over as much as you do. This is as tiresome to me as it is to you. We already know about your crimes; it is a mere formality for you to write out your confession. Why don't we get it over with so that everything can be settled and you can be released?"

Prisoners find this sudden friendship and release of pressure almost irresistible. Nearly all of them avidly seize the opportunity to talk about themselves and their feelings, and then go on to talk about their families. Most of them proceed from this almost automatically to giving the information which the interrogator seeks. Even if they do not provide everything the interrogator wants at this time, he may continue his friendly demeanor and the relaxation of pressure for several more sessions before resuming the old regimen of torture. But if the prisoner does reveal significant information and cooperates fully, the rewards are prompt and gratifying. The interrogator smiles and congratulates him. Cigarettes are forthcoming. There is a large meal, often excellently prepared and served; and after this the prisoner returns to his cell and sleeps as long as he likes, in any position that he chooses.

15. The Course of the Interrogation

Such friendly and rewarding behavior will continue for several days—usually as long as the interrogator feels that a significant amount of new information is being produced. At this point the prisoner may conclude that his ordeal is over; but invariably he is disappointed. For as soon as the interrogator decides that no new information is being yielded, the regimen of constant pressure and hostile interrogation is resumed. Again it is carried to the point at which the prisoner is near breakdown. Again it is relaxed, and again the prisoner is rewarded if he cooperates. In this manner, proceeding with regular steps, alternating punishment with reward, the interrogator constantly presses the prisoner to revise and rewrite the protocol until it contains all the statements which he desires, and is in a final form which meets with his approval. When it has at last been agreed upon and signed, the pressure is relaxed "for good"; but the prisoner continues to live in his cell, and remains under the threat of renewed pressure, until such

time as he has been taken before a "court," has confessed, and has been "sentenced."

Throughout the entire interrogation period, the prisoner is under some form of medical observation. Prison physicians are familiar with all the effects produced by KGB procedures, and evidently they are skilled at judging just how far the various procedures can be carried without killing or permanently damaging the prisoner. Prisoners who have been beaten have their wounds carefully dressed. Those who are forced to stand for long periods of time are examined periodically during the procedure. Sometimes the physician intervenes to call a halt if he feels the prisoner is in danger. The unintended death of a prisoner during the interrogation procedure is regarded as a serious error on the part of the prison officials.

16. The Psychological Interaction Between Prisoner and Interrogator

During the interrogation the psychological interaction between the prisoner and the interrogator is perhaps even more important than the physical aspects of the procedure itself. It has been said that the interrogator approaches the prisoner with the assumption that he is guilty. It is important that we define this statement precisely. It does not mean that the interrogator is not aware of the "true facts" of the situation, but means that he interprets them in the light of Communist ideology. The KGB officer is a Communist. He has selected this prisoner from one of the groups of suspects described earlier. The man was arrested because the KGB, which represents the Communist State, regarded him as a menace to the Party or its program. Anyone who is a menace to the Party is, by definition, guilty of threatening the security of the Communist State. Ergo, from the Communist point of view, the man is "guilty." In other words, the KGB has decided that this man must be dealt with in some manner, "for the good of the State." Once the man has been arrested, this point is no longer open to question. This is the true, or "esoteric," meaning of the frequently repeated Communist statement that "in a Communist state, innocent people are never arrested." If one accepts their definition of "guilt" and "innocence," this is indeed a fact. This is what is meant by the statement that the interrogator "assumes that the prisoner is guilty at the time of his arrest."

However, the interrogator frequently does not know just what specific major "crimes" the man may have committed. In fact, KGB officers have stated quite clearly that most of the people whom they arrest have not really "committed" any specific serious crimes at all. But they do know that the prisoner has "committed" some acts which are contrary to the broad Soviet laws against political crimes, as well as minor "actual" crimes. Furthermore, experience has taught them that if they put enough pressure upon the prisoner, sooner or later they will get him to "confess" to "acts" which can be interpreted as a "major crime." Once this confession has been obtained, the KGB can demand from the "judge" a punishment equivalent to that which it intended that the prisoner should receive when it arrested him.

Much of the activity of the interrogator can be looked upon as a process of persuasion. The primary work of the interrogator is to convince the prisoner that what he did was a crime. Having got the "evidence" from his informers and from the prisoner, it is up to him to persuade the prisoner that certain actions which he has carried out constitute a crime. The prisoner is usually prepared to

admit that the acts have been carried out. Often as not, he revealed them freely because he did not consider them to be criminal. It is up to the interrogator to make the prisoner see that these acts do constitute a serious crime, and acknowledge this by signing a deposition and making a confession in court if necessary. The Communist legal system requires that this be done before a case can be settled.

The fact that the interrogator is a dedicated Communist makes his task of persuasion somewhat easier. The interrogator approaches the prisoner with the knowledge that the man is actually a criminal by Communist definition, and he has a large body of convenient Communist definitions and rationalizations to help him in convincing his victim of this. For example, according to Communist theory, acts are judged by their "objective effects" rather than by the motives of those who committed them. Thus, if a prisoner, through an honest mistake, has damaged a piece of machinery belonging to the State, he is a "wrecker." Objectively, he has wrecked an important piece of property belonging to the State. The fact that he did this with innocent motives is meaningless. Thus a "mistake," an "accident," and a "crime" all become the same thing. Likewise, according to Communist theory, a man's acts and thoughts are judged "consequentially." Thus, if a prisoner is known to have said that the KGB is too powerful, the fact that he has said this may make him a "traitor" and "saboteur." The Communist reasoning is that a man who says that the KGB is too powerful believes that it is too powerful and will ultimately act upon this belief. This ultimate act will constitute sabotage and treason; therefore, the man is a saboteur and a traitor. Similarly, a man who has friendly associations with foreign nationals must have some friendly feeling toward them; foreign governments are capitalist and imperialist; a man who is friendly to foreign nationals is giving help to the agents of capitalist imperialism; therefore, the man is a spy whether he realizes it or not. Such peculiar twists of Communist logic are difficult for Western prisoners to accept at first. Usually they object strenuously to these definitions of "treason," "wrecking," and "sabotage"; but ultimately, under constant pressure and persuasion, a prisoner usually agrees to some statement to the effect that "by Communist laws I am a spy." Thereafter, there follows further argument and persuasion to the effect that a person is judged by the laws of the country in which the crimes are committed. Ultimately the qualifying phrase is omitted, and the final deposition contains the simple statement, "I am a spy."

An effective method of persuasion frequently used when more than one suspect is involved in the same "case" is what KGB officers often call "confrontation." When one prisoner has "broken," has made the necessary rationalizations, has accepted his interrogator's persuasion, and has signed an acceptable protocol, he is brought face to face with a fellow prisoner. Usually he has implicated this man in his own protocol and has "confessed" to the same crimes which the recalcitrant prisoner has denied. The resisting man feels completely undermined when he sees that his former comrade and friend has capitulated. He may bitterly accuse him and be bitterly accused in turn, but quite frequently the experience makes him feel the futility of further resistance, and often the prisoner who has confessed patiently attempts to persuade his friend to accept the same rationalization that he has made and to bow to the inevitable.

One important reason why KGB officers regard interrogation as emotionally trying lies in the fact that a strong interpersonal relationship grows up between

the prisoner and the interrogator. In many respects this is like the relationship that grows up between a psychiatrist and his patient. The prisoner, for all the pressure that he has been under, eventually finds in the interrogator the one human being in his environment to whom he can relate. The interrogator, on his part, has no personal hostility to his victim. He may actually like him. Especially when dealing with a Communist, he may feel that but for chance he would be in the prisoner's place. Interrogator and prisoner spend many hours of many days together. A certain comradeship and understanding grows up between them.

Many of these KGB officers impress the prisoner by the sincerity of their dedication to Communism and its ostensible ideals. The interrogator often displays a patient sympathy which becomes apparent to the prisoner. His attitude that "this is something we must go through with, and neither you nor I can stop until you have cooperated and signed a proper confession" is to some extent a genuine attitude. The KGB system allows of no other solution from the interrogator's point of view. It is in fact true that the interrogation will have to go on until a proper deposition has been signed. The prisoner often comes to recognize this sincerity. Many see that indeed the interrogator must follow the system, and there is nothing which he can do about it. Thus, the prisoner, in his need for companionship, may displace his hostility from the interrogator to the "system." Many interrogators genuinely plead with the prisoner to learn to "see the truth," to "think correctly," and to "cooperate."

There are instances of prisoners who signed depositions largely out of sympathy for their interrogators, because they felt that these men would be punished if a proper deposition were not forthcoming. In other words, the warm and friendly feelings which develop between the prisoner and the interrogator may have a powerful influence on the prisoner's behavior. Not infrequently, the prisoner develops a feeling that the interrogator is the only warm and sympathetic person in the hostile and threatening world in which he exists. His need for human companionship and acceptance is such that he overlooks the pressures which the interrogator puts upon him and ascribes them to the necessities of the system rather than to the willful activity of his "friend." If the interrogator rejects the prisoner or implies that he disapproves of him, the prisoner may feel bereft. He may blame himself for having let the interrogator down or for not having cooperated with the man who was trying to help him. His efforts to maintain his good standing in the eyes of his "friend" become an important motive for him to seek a rationalization which will allow him to produce a protocol of the type his "friend" needs. This same desire "not to go back on a friend" also becomes one of the reasons why he does not repudiate the protocol later when it is presented in court.

17. The Reaction of the Prisoner to the Interrogation

The way in which a prisoner reacts to the whole process of interrogation is to a great extent dependent upon the manner of man he is, his preexisting attitudes and beliefs, and the circumstances surrounding his arrest and imprisonment. All prisoners have this in common: They have been isolated and have been under unrelenting pressure in an atmosphere of hostility and uncertainty. They all find themselves in a dilemma at the time that the interrogation begins. The regimen of pressure and isolation has created an over-all discomfort which is well nigh intolerable. The prisoner invariably feels that "something must be done to end

this." He must find a way out. Death is denied to him. Ultimately, he finds himself faced with the choice of continuing interminably under the intolerable pressures of his captors or of accepting the "way out" which the interrogator offers. The "way out" is a rationalization. It allows the prisoner to meet the demands of his interrogator by degrees, at the same time retaining within himself some shred of belief that by his own standards he has not capitulated. With rare exceptions prisoners always accept this "way out," provided the pressures are sufficiently prolonged and intense and the interrogator can adjust his persuasiveness in a proper manner.

Various categories of prisoners respond to different types of persuasion. Persons who have been lifelong members of the Communist Party are familiar with the Communist concept of "crime" and the functions of the KGB. Furthermore, they have all been trained in the ritual of self-criticism, confession, punishment, and rehabilitation, which has been part of Communist procedure since before the Revolution. Many Communists can rationalize a belief that they are actually criminals, as specified by the KGB, and come to see their punishment as necessary for the good of the State and the Party. To the true Party member, martyrdom for such a reason carries with it an air of triumph.

Those who have studied the purge trials of the old Bolsheviks are convinced that this form of reasoning was behind their apparently peculiar behavior at the trials. These men held nothing sacred but the Party. They had dedicated their lives to the principle that the Party could do no wrong. They themselves looked upon deviationists as criminals worthy of the ultimate punishment. Zinoviev, Kammenev, and their followers knew themselves to be chronic oppositionists. Lenin had expelled them from the Party during the 1917 revolution and had reinstated them after they had confessed and recanted. In 1927 they had again been expelled by the Party and temporarily exiled; they had made abject recantations and had again been reinstated. But these men were chronic nonconformists. In some way, by their attitudes rather than by any deed, they had continued to be in partial disagreement with Stalin and other members of the party leadership. When they were arrested in 1936, it is said that the NKVD did not have very great difficulty in convincing them that they were criminals. They readily agreed to it. There was more difficulty in convincing them that the good of the Party demanded that they be publicly tried and executed; but after much tortuous logic they accepted this also. It is said that the interrogators and prisoners broke down and wept together when the final agreement was reached. Their "confessions" before the court contained an exposition of their crimes of which they were guilty "according to Communist theory," expressed as if these crimes had "actually been committed" in the Western, or popular, use of the word, whereas they were actually only "objective" or "consequential" crimes as defined by the Communist theory.

Non-Communist prisoners of idealistic beliefs or Socialist sympathies apparently make ready targets for the logic of the interrogator. Such persons are usually compelled to agree that the ostensible and idealistic motives of the Communist Party are "good," and that those who oppose these ideals are "bad." The rationalization in this case takes the form of getting the prisoner to say that the Communist Party has the same value system that he does. Something which the prisoner has done is "bad" by his own definition. From this point the prisoner proceeds through the usual steps to the ultimate signing of the deposition.

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

Persons who carry with them strong feelings of guilt associated with highly organized systems of moral values likewise become ready targets for the persuasion of the interrogator. Very few people are entirely free of guilt feelings, but often such feelings are found in the highest degree in those in whom they are least appropriate. For example, many strongly religious people have a profound sense of sin. They feel guilty of shortcomings of their own, which are much smaller than those found in most of their fellow men. They constantly see themselves as transgressing their own moral code, and in the need of forgiveness for doing so. Skilled interrogators make use of this. They point out that many of the ostensible ideals of Communism are the same as the ideals to which the prisoner himself subscribes. Since he has transgressed his own code, he is a criminal in Communist eyes also. Thus, Chinese interrogators who are experienced in the interrogation of priests develop an extensive knowledge of the Bible and Christian theology. They can draw parallels between Christianity and Communism, and, in fact, often identify the two as being different aspects of the same philosophical system. It is not hard to show the prisoner many points at which he has failed to live up to the Christian code. It is usually not very difficult to create within him a feeling of guilt about this. From here, it is also not difficult to get him to agree that, because of his un-Christian acts, he has injured "the people," whom Christ loved. The Communist Party is also interested in the welfare of "the people"; therefore, all the prisoner needs to do is confess that he has sinned against "the people" and has committed crimes against them. A confession of "crime against the people" is a satisfactory confession in a Communist court.

An additional vulnerability of highly moral people is that they find it difficult to tell a lie under any circumstances. Priests, for example, often give aid and comfort to those oppressed by Communist states. It is not too difficult for the police to find out about this, and it sometimes is very difficult for the priest to lie about it when presented with the evidence. From this point, it is not difficult to persuade the priest to confess that he has indeed given comfort to the enemies of the regime.

On the other hand, persons with so-called sociopathic or psychopathic personalities, who have few or no moral scruples, may also be vulnerable. Such persons have very little attachment to friends and to moral principles. They may be readily accessible to bribes and to various promises of reward. Under pressure they quite readily reveal all of the information they possess and freely implicate their associates. They readily rationalize the necessity for finding a "way out" of their situations and have little or no conflict about deserting any principles which they were supposed to possess. They need only to see what the KGB wants in the form of a "confession" in order to fabricate one without compunction. KGB officers are not entirely taken in by this lying. They do not hesitate to use the "confession," but they edit out the more fantastic parts from the final deposition.

Persons who are "caught with the goods" in actual crimes are equally vulnerable. This includes persons who have "actually" in the Western sense of the word committed espionage or treason. If the KGB has uncovered real evidence of this, it is quite likely that sooner or later, with constant pressure and interrogation, they will get the prisoner to admit it also. In this instance, the facts of the case are agreed upon by all concerned, and it remains only to determine the punishment.

The maze in which any prisoner finds himself has so many ramifications that it is almost impossible for him to escape from it without signing a protocol and being convicted. Anything he has done may be a crime. He has been adjudged guilty before his arrest. He is put in a situation of intolerable pressure. It is made clear to him that his only way out of this situation is to cooperate with the interrogator. He is offered a reasonable rationalization for doing so. Sooner or later under these circumstances, the prisoner and the interrogator almost inevitably come to an agreement upon a deposition which satisfies the interrogator. But not inevitably: There are reported instances of prisoners who have refused to sign any form of deposition and have remained in detention indefinitely, with their cases still unresolved, or have been tried summarily by an administrative court of the state police. Gomulka resisted the Polish UB. Elizabeth Lermolo, a woman who was implicated in the Kirov murder, resisted the NKVD and later escaped. It is alleged that she remained in detention, with periodic interrogation from 1936 until 1941, when the Germans overran her prison and she was released. It is said that she never signed a deposition. Whether this is a true story or not is not known. But it is known that of all the millions who passed through the hands of NKVD during the time of the purges, and who have fallen into the hands of its successors since then, few have escaped without signing a deposition which amounted to a confession of crime, as crimes are defined in Communist Russia.

18. The "Trial"

When the prisoner has finally reached the point of admitting his "crimes," and he and the interrogator have agreed upon a protocol satisfactory to both of them, he experiences a profound feeling of relief, which is sometimes shared by the man who has been questioning him. Even though his crimes may be serious and the punishment for them severe and of unknown degree, he welcomes a surcease from the unrelenting pressures and miseries of the interrogation procedure. Whatever the future may hold for him, he has for the moment found a way out of an intolerable situation.

When a satisfactory deposition has been prepared and signed, the pressures upon the prisoner are customarily relaxed. He is allowed to sleep as long as he wishes; he may have reading and writing material in his room. Sometimes he can join with other prisoners in periods of exercise. His meals improve and his guards become friendly, or even solicitous. This easy treatment is continued until he is thoroughly rested and his health has been restored. Then, in most cases, he is taken before a "court." The state prosecutor presents the court with the signed protocol and questions the prisoner about his crimes. Sometimes a "defense attorney" is assigned; this man invariably limits himself to requesting leniency from the court. The whole procedure is usually brief and formal. There are no verdicts of "not guilty." The function of the "judge" is solely that of presiding over the trial and passing upon the prisoner a sentence which has usually been agreed upon beforehand by the prosecutor and the KGB officer in charge of the case.

It is this aspect of the proceedings which is most bewildering to Western observers. It is easy to understand how prisoners can be tortured into signing confessions of crimes which they did not commit, but it is difficult to understand why the prisoners do not renounce these confessions later at the public trials.

Beginning with the purge trials of the 1930's, the NKVD and its successors

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

and offspring in Russia, the Eastern European nations, and China have presented the world with a series of public trials at which the prisoners calmly and seemingly without coercion make outrageous "confessions" of unbelievable crimes, praise their captors, and ask for the severest punishment for themselves. These prisoners have included important Communist officials, former NKVD officers, non-Communist citizens of various categories, and foreigners of the most diverse backgrounds. All of these prisoners were apparently "innocent"; some faced certain death, and many were profoundly anti-Communist. Men of the highest caliber and integrity, such as Cardinal Mindszenty, William Oatis, and Robert Vogeler, seemed to have the strongest possible motivations to resist; but none of them stood up in court and denounced the confession and his captors. This phenomenon demands an explanation.

The explanation is available, but it is not simple. It is necessary to examine the proposition in detail in order to view it in its proper light.

First, it is by no means true that "all prisoners confess freely at a public trial." Only a very small minority of prisoners of the Communist state police ever appear at a public trial. The KGB will not expose a prisoner to a public trial unless it is convinced that he will go through with his confession as planned. If there is any doubt about this, no public trial is held. But even with this precaution the KGB is not infallible. At the purge trials several of the prisoners tried to recant parts of their confessions. When a prisoner tried to recant, the prosecutor halted the examination of that person. Usually, when the man returned from his cell several days later, he was again docile and cooperative. In the Bulgarian trials, Traicho Kostov repudiated his entire protocol on two occasions. Some of these so-called "public trials" have not actually been public. They have been carried out in the presence of a select audience while movies and recordings are made of the prisoner's words, which are later transmitted to the public.

The majority of prisoners do "come to trial," but these trials are not public. They are held *in camera*. The state police are concerned only with political crimes and espionage. Their prisoners are tried before "military tribunals," which are not public courts. Those present are only the interrogator, the state prosecutor, the prisoner, the judges, a few stenographers, and perhaps a few officers of the court. At such a trial there is no opportunity for "public protest," and any protest which is made can be readily expunged from the record. So far as the prisoner is concerned, this so-called trial appears as nothing more than the next step in his process of imprisonment. He has been imprisoned, tortured, and interrogated and has signed a "confession." Following that, he has experienced more lenient treatment and has had a period of rest and rehabilitation. But he has not been out of the prison. He has not seen any of his friends or family or anyone interested in defending him. He has remained entirely in the hands of his interrogators and guards, with access to no one else. When he finally comes before the "court," he sees no one except the state prosecutor, the judge, and the court officials. The defense attorney, if one is assigned, shows not the slightest interest in refuting any of the "evidence" in the confession or in establishing a plea of "not guilty." He never questions the fact that the prisoner is guilty as charged. Sometimes he asks the judge for leniency; but not infrequently he informs the court that he is convinced the prisoner is just as big a monster as the prosecution says he is, and that he cannot bring himself to ask the court for leniency. The judge likewise shows no interest in the question of guilt or innocence. He limits

himself to maintaining order in the court and passing sentence. If the prisoner has any illusions that the prosecutor, the judge, and the defense attorney are going to allow him any opportunity to dispute the "facts in the case," these are soon dispelled.

By no means do all prisoners receive a "trial" of any sort. Those who are stubborn or repeatedly recant their confessions during the interrogation procedure will not be trusted, even at private trials. Uncooperative and stubborn prisoners, and those who might make embarrassing statements are "dealt with administratively." For many years the state police have had the right to carry out "administrative" trials for any prisoners whom they do not wish to expose to the usual trial procedure. These administrative trials consist of simply presenting the prisoner to a group of three senior police officers (the Troika), who pass sentence immediately and have it carried out forthwith. These administrative trials took place within the detention prison. Sometimes the prisoner was not even present at them; sentence was passed by the Troika merely upon the basis of the signed protocol. Sometimes the alleged records of these trials were made public, but generally the fact that such a trial had taken place was never revealed. For every Soviet citizen who has appeared at a public trial, there have been thousands who have been tried only at private trials by military tribunals, and hundreds who were dealt with administratively by the police themselves. Thus, a great number of high Communist officials, captured German officers, and similar prisoners who fell into the hands of the Russian secret police were not tried at all. So far as the public was concerned, they merely disappeared.

During the last few months there have been press reports that the right of administrative trial has been withdrawn from the KGB. It remains to be seen whether or not this is true.

19. Public Confessions

If we exclude from consideration all those prisoners who are dealt with administratively, two questions remain: 1. Why do all of those prisoners who are tried in private confess almost without exception? 2. Why do some prisoners confess at public trials, where there is actually some opportunity to make an open denial of guilt?

In response to the question of why prisoners at private trials confess almost without exception, the following answers can be given:

1. The setting of the private trial, as we have just described it, makes it apparent to the prisoner that any attempt at recantation is useless.

2. The prisoner at a private trial is always under actual threat by the KGB. The officer in charge of his case has clearly indicated to him that any attempt to alter or recant any part of his confession will lead to an immediate resumption of the interrogation-torture regimen. This threat is as poignant as a cocked pistol. The prisoner has just finished being carried through torture and interrogation over and over again to the point at which it is absolutely intolerable to him. He has already decided that, whatever his sentence may be, he prefers to receive his punishment rather than to return to the horrible ordeal through which he has just passed. In the opinion of KGB officers, this is the most potent reason why no prisoner changes his story.

3. Warm and positive feelings between prisoners and their interrogating officers often develop during the interrogation process, and many prisoners come to trial with the feeling that if they attempt to alter their testimony they will be

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

dishonoring an agreement with their interrogators (see Section 16).

4. Finally, it is to be emphasized that, in spite of all these detriments, some prisoners do recant at their private trials. The court then decides that these prisoners have not yet reached a full awareness of their crimes. They are sent back to the detention prison and once again put through the torture-interrogation regimen. Sooner or later, they learn that pleas of "not guilty" are not acceptable in Soviet courts, and that they must behave themselves at their trials. Otherwise, they are indefinitely detained or executed.

In answering the question of why some prisoners confess publicly when there is some opportunity for them to renounce their confessions and thereby embarrass their captors, one must consider the various categories of those who have been tried in public. Widely publicized trials are staged by the Communists only under exceptional circumstances and always for propaganda purposes. They are carefully managed "set pieces" in which every performer must play his role exactly as prescribed. The KGB and other Communist police organizations select the prisoners for these shows with great care.

The first category of those who have made public confessions are prominent Bolsheviks who have fallen from grace: Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, Bukharin, Radek and their associates, at the time of the great purges; more recently, Laslo Rajk, in Hungary; Traicho Kostov, in Bulgaria, and Slansky, Clementis, and others, in Czechoslovakia. The list is extensive, but not nearly so extensive as the list of prominent Communist officials who were liquidated administratively.

But why did those confess; who did so? The old Bolsheviks "confessed" primarily because they were lifelong, dedicated Communists. They had committed their lives to the belief that nothing is sacred but the Party, and the Party is always right. If there be a central point in the Communist creed, it is this. These men all subscribed to the belief that opposition to the Party line, as expressed by the Party leaders, is a crime. Whatever else they were, they were "chronic oppositionists," and knew themselves to be so. They all subscribed to the Communist ritual of public self-criticism and punishment. Nearly all of them had at one time or another publicly criticized themselves and had been punished. Several had been expelled from the Party, not once but several times. They all knew themselves to be in opposition to the Party leadership, and they all felt guilty about this. In spite of this, they still considered themselves to be Bolsheviks, and were prepared in principle to accept any demand which the Party might make upon them, even to the point of death.

All of the evidence points to the fact that the NKVD, using the interrogation-pressure process which we have described, persuaded these men to accept the concept that because they were opposed to Stalin, the leader of the party, they were wrecking the Party. As good Bolsheviks, the Party called upon them to make the ultimate sacrifice by denouncing themselves and giving up their lives so that the world could know that opposition to the Party leadership was both criminal and futile. The "crimes" to which they confessed publicly were not "actual" crimes in the Western sense of the term, but were "objective" or "consequential" crimes, which must result from their opposition according to Communist theory. Ultimately they made their confessions almost with an air of triumph, and went to their deaths seeing themselves as martyrs to the cause to which they had devoted their lives. Some of them—Krestinsky, for example—had difficulty, recanted a bit, and defied the prosecutor briefly; but after a few

days of persuasion they resumed their roles and carried the trial through to its end.

This behavior on the part of the highly disciplined and religiously dedicated "old Bolsheviks" is not unusual in the annals of human behavior. It is not inexplicable that these men who hated Stalin nevertheless played their roles and went to their deaths for the sake of the Party. The reader has but to consider how many soldiers, in wars throughout the course of history, have proceeded to certain death in response to what they knew to be stupid and disastrous orders, given by incompetent officers whom they hated; and how many wives have spent a lifetime in supporting and defending drunken and brutal husbands, whom they detested. People dedicated to a cause will destroy both their lives and their reputations for it. That Communists will do this we know well from our experiences in this country. The Rosenbergs could have escaped death had they been willing to confess to their espionage and reveal their contacts, but they refused to do so.

The information available to us about the trials of the Communist leaders in the Eastern European satellites indicates that their behavior can be explained on the same basis as that of the old Bolsheviks. These trials were not the success that one might assume from their awesome popular reputation. Rajk confessed obediently and went to his death like a proper Bolshevik; but Kostov denounced his accusers and proclaimed his innocence. The Polish police never dared to expose Gomulka to a trial of any sort. Tito defected and purged his would-be purgers. There have been no truly public trials since those times. The trials of Slansky and his colleagues were recorded in private, and selected excerpts of the transcripts were broadcast. Beria and Abakumov were tried entirely *in camera* by a military tribunal.

Another category of those who have confessed publicly is that group of intellectually or idealistically motivated people who were thought to be opposed to Communism, or at least to be non-Communist, prior to their arrest. Most prominent in this group is Cardinal Mindszenty; also included in this are other Roman Catholic priests from the satellite countries.

The Mindszenty case is the best known. In the public mind Mindszenty is the prototype of "Communist brain washing." Among the known facts of his case are these:

Cardinal Mindszenty came from an old and aristocratic Hungarian family; he had many friends among the Hungarian aristocracy and the nobility. He had always supported the monarchical form of government. During the period between the wars, when Hungary was a regency, he had been in favor of the restoration of the Hapsburgs to the Hungarian throne. He was a man of strong religious convictions, who held himself, as well as others, to a high code of moral conduct. Governmental administrators sometimes found him a difficult man to deal with because he was inflexible in upholding his moral principles.

During the Second World War he came into open conflict with the Nazis, and with the members of the Hungarian Fascist Arrow-Cross organization; but these organizations did not dare arrest him because of his position in the church and because of the respect and admiration in which the Roman Catholic population of Hungary held him. It was partly because he had become such a symbol of the integrity and independence of the church that he was elevated to the position of Cardinal in 1945.

Cardinal Mindszenty did not hesitate to make known his opposition to the Communist regime. He made no attempt to conceal his sympathy for many of

those oppressed by it. He maintained his association with his friends among the former aristocracy. He gave support and encouragement to those, both inside and outside the country, who, he thought, might end the Communist dictatorship and restore a legal government. He was arrested in December, 1948, after a propaganda campaign had been carried on against him for several years. Approximately six weeks later, he "confessed" at a public trial. All of the evidence indicates that the treatment which Cardinal Mindszenty received during his period of interrogation did not differ in any important detail from that which is used by the KGB, which we have described above. The only drugs which the Cardinal received were stimulants to keep him awake during the long hours of interrogation, and possibly sedatives to allow him to sleep when he was exhausted. There is no reason to believe that any new, esoteric, or unknown method was used in handling him and no need to assume that there was.

Cardinal Mindszenty's confession is published in the "Hungarian Yellow Book." In his published depositions, he acknowledges that he is a royalist, that he had favored the restoration of the monarchy, and that he had hoped that the international situation would develop in a way which would cause the United States to intervene and allow the monarchy to be restored. He agrees that he had continued to communicate with his monarchist friends, both in Hungary and abroad, and with various American authorities. He agrees that he was hostile to the Communist regime. "It was in the interests of this that I did everything to support American politics in Hungary, partly by my activity against the Hungarian Republic, and partly by constantly urging their interference, by a regular service of facts, and by espionage." This sentence, translated by Hungarian Communists, is typical of those found in Communist depositions; it can equally well be interpreted to mean that Mindszenty had committed espionage (in the Communist sense of the word) or that he had urged the Americans to make known the facts and to commit espionage. The "facts" in the "Yellow Book," even if accepted at face value, reveal the Cardinal to have been a Hungarian patriot and a vigorous anti-Communist, but not a spy.

Cardinal Mindszenty's trial was "public," but not all of his statements were broadcast. The broadcast portions were cut, evidently at points where he made significant reservations. But, even so, his widely publicized confession was no declaration of profound guilt. At his trial Cardinal Mindszenty stated that he recognized that some of his activities had been contrary to the laws of the Communist state. He stated that he was sorry he had violated the laws. If his actions had in any way harmed the people of Hungary or the Roman Catholic Church, he asked forgiveness for this. He agreed that he would be willing to step aside as leader of the Hungarian Church if this would be in the best interest of the people and the Church.

On the basis of this confession the Communists convicted him of being a "reactionary criminal" and of taking part in a "treasonable monarchist plot" to secure United States intervention and to overthrow the government of Hungary. He was sentenced to life imprisonment.

Still a third category of those who have confessed publicly are various foreign businessmen, newspapermen, and military men who were arrested or captured in the course of their routine duties, of whom Robert Vogeler, in Hungary, and William Oatis, in Czechoslovakia, are examples. In all these cases the following factors are evident:

1. The confessions made by the prisoners were "actually true" in the sense that some of the specific acts described in the confessions actually occurred, although not necessarily in the way in which they were described.

2. The interpretation put upon these acts was the Communist interpretation.

3. The prisoner had been brought to agree that in the country in which he was arrested the Communist laws applied and, therefore, these acts constituted a crime. The prisoner, therefore, pleaded guilty to "crimes" which were "crimes" by Communist definition, but which he had not intended as crimes, or considered to be crimes at the time that he carried them out. This qualification, however, was missing from the statements made by the prisoners at the trials.

4. All of these prisoners were under the threat of renewed interrogation-torture if they recanted or changed their confessions.

5. Many of them had the actual or implied promise, as well as the firm belief, that they would be released if they cooperated with the police.

6. Furthermore, all of them were able to rationalize that their confessions would not be believed by Americans in any case. This rationalization was essentially a correct one—their confessions were widely disbelieved in the United States, but in some other areas of the world their confessions are accepted as factual.

20. Punishment

The period of interrogation and detention, no matter how long and terrible it may be, is not considered imprisonment. The "punishment" begins only after the sentence has been passed. Sometimes a "lenient" judge will allow the prisoner to count his period of detention as a part of a prison sentence, but often this period is discounted altogether. According to Communist theory, the purpose of prison systems is to rehabilitate criminals through wholesome work, productive activity, and education. For this "purpose" prisoners are transported to Siberia or the Arctic, where most of them spend their terms working in mines and construction projects under brutal and primitive conditions. Those who are fortunate enough to receive any education during this procedure are "educated" by further indoctrination with Communist ideas.

III. Practices in Communist China

1. A Comparison of Chinese Methods with Those of the KGB

The methods used by the state police in China are basically similar to those used by the KGB, but they are not "carbon copies," like those of the Communist-dominated countries of Eastern Europe. They are different in several important details.

1. The goal of the KGB detention and interrogation procedure is the preparation of a protocol upon which a suitable punishment can be based, so that the KGB can then deal with the prisoner according to its preconceived idea of what must be done for the good of the Party and the Soviet State. In a minority of cases, this includes a public trial for propaganda purposes. The KGB does not appear to be greatly concerned about the future attitudes and behavior of the prisoner, so long as he behaves properly during the period of trial and sentencing.

The goal of the Chinese detention and interrogation procedure, on the other hand, is primarily that of ensuring that the prisoner will develop a relatively long-lasting change in his attitudes and overt behavior, which will be sustained after his release, so that he will not again constitute a danger to the Communist

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

state.[¶] The securing of information by interrogation, the preparation of proper protocols and "confessions," and the participation of the prisoners in public propaganda trials are secondary to this primary goal.

2. Unlike the KGB, the Chinese make extensive use of group interaction among prisoners, in obtaining information, applying pressures, and carrying out indoctrination.

3. Whereas in the Soviet Union and Eastern European states the ritual of public self-criticism, confession, self-degradation, punishment, and rehabilitation is a Party procedure confined to Communists, the Chinese have extended this practice to the non-Party population, and to the prison population in particular, and have made it an important feature of their indoctrination procedure.

4. In China, at the moment at least, the period of detention is greatly prolonged. Whereas in the Soviet Union trial and sentencing take place fairly soon after the completion of the interrogation and the preparation of a suitable protocol, in China the preparation of a first confession is only a prelude to a long period of indoctrination and reeducation, which may go on for years, and is not terminated until those in charge of the prisoner believe that he has finally adopted a "correct" attitude and behavior. It is only then that the "trial," the "sentencing" and the formal term of imprisonment or other punishment begins.

Procedures in China are much less standardized than those in Russia, and many variations upon them can be expected. This is in part the result of the newness of the Chinese Communist regime and the lack of homogeneity of its personnel and facilities. The procedure outlined below is carried out in the large prisons in major cities. In outlying areas there may be differences in detail, but the general principles and practices are the same.

2. Background and Organization of the Chinese State Police

The Chinese Communist Party was formed in 1919; from that time forward a steady flow of young Chinese Communists were trained in Russian Party schools. Nevertheless, Chinese Communism developed along lines which were in many ways different from those of Western Communist parties. Communism was able to sustain itself only in rural China, where it fed upon poverty and discontent of the Chinese peasants. Mao's army lived off the countryside and of necessity became closely identified with the value systems of the peasant group, from which most of its numbers originated.

In the years from 1936 to 1946, while these Chinese Communists were busy expanding and recruiting new members from the general Chinese population, they gradually developed a highly organized and vigorous indoctrination program. It was aimed at all potential recruits who happened to fall into their hands. Uneducated peasants, city workers, and captured KMT troops, as well as interested students from the universities, were subjects for this indoctrination.

In order to create in this heterogeneous group a feeling of comradeship and identification with the peasant Communists, it was necessary to make them "cut their ties to the past." Therefore, the training program included a deliberate as-

[¶] The official regulations for Chinese detention prisons include the following statement: "In dealing with the criminals, there shall be regularly adopted measures of collective study classes, individual interviews, study of assigned documents, and organized discussion, to educate them in the admission of guilt and obedience to law, political and current events, labor production, and culture, so as to expose the nature of the crime committed, thoroughly wipe out criminal thoughts, and establish a new moral code."

sault upon all of the traditional "bourgeois," "reactionary," "upper-class" attitudes, beliefs, and practices the recruits brought with them. Trainees were forced to abandon their refinements of speech, manner, and behavior, their reverence for family ties and worldly goods, and to adopt the crude and earthy attitudes and behavior of the new "people's army." This questioning and discussion of behavior and value systems was accompanied by the inculcation of a fanatical enthusiasm for the Communist movement, built around the ideal of the rejuvenation of China and its reestablishment of a dynamic, modern society (an ideal which had been shared by the majority of Chinese intellectuals and reformers since the days of Sun Yat Sen). The combination of Communist practices, such as public confession and self-criticism, with traditional Chinese methods of learning by rote and repetition resulted in a highly effective method of persuasion. These methods, as applied to the general population following the success of the revolution in 1949, have been referred to as methods of "thought reform" or "ideological reform" #; and, as we have seen, these phrases were finally transferred into English under the generic term of "brain washing."

The Chinese have shown great skill in the development of these methods and their application, but, like the Russians, they developed their methods by trial and error, through practice, and through the application of known principles. There is no evidence that psychologists, neurophysiologists, or other scientists participated in their development.

After the Communist triumph in 1949 a large number of "special advisers" were sent from Russia to help set up the Chinese state police and espionage systems, and to train the Chinese in Soviet methods.

The Chinese state police are organized on the same lines as the KGB. The central direction is at Peking and resides in the "Ministry of Public Safety," which is similar to the MVD. This Ministry has diverse functions, such as the control of frontiers, the uncovering of economic and political offenses, the management of traffic on waterways, and even the administration of certain public health measures. Those under its control include 2,000,000 members of the "Public Safety Corps" (similar to the paramilitary units of the KGB) and 10,000,000 "militia," or local police. Both the rural and the city police are responsible to it. The secret police organization, itself, is only one part of the over-all structure of this Ministry.

There are administrative divisions of the state police in each of the administrative areas into which China was divided after the Communist take-over. In each village and hamlet, in addition to the militia and rural police, the Communists set up what they call "Public Safety Subcommittees." These have three to five members selected from the local citizenry on the basis of their loyalty and enthusiasm for the new regime. Their job is essentially that of carrying out "census" investigations. The "census" is an all-embracing record of everything that goes on in the village. It covers the name, sex, age, nativity, occupation, education, family status, political affiliation, social relations, economic condition, and activities of every resident. Everyone who wishes to change his residence, change his occupation, or visit a friend is supposed to report this fact to the Public Safety Subcommittee. Those who wish to travel from one locality to another must obtain a travel pass in order to do so.

The term "brain washing" is not used by the Chinese, and should be avoided, for it has no precise meaning. The Chinese phrase is "Szu hsing K'ei Tsao," which means "ideological reform." It is sometimes shortened to "K'ei Tsao," or "reform."

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

Undoubtedly, the records maintained by these rural subcommittees are not so voluminous or detailed as they are alleged to be, and it is quite probable that the peasants have developed various means of circumventing their surveillance. Nevertheless, the men who make up these committees know their villages, and all that goes on within them. They are urged to increase their knowledge by frequent and unexpected visits among their neighbors, and evidently they do so. The result is that the committee is able to extend to the individual Chinese the direct control of the administrative apparatus of the central government to a degree to which this control has not been felt for many centuries. The "census" and the "Public Safety Subcommittee" have been among the most important means by which the Communists have fastened their control upon the vast Chinese population. They are, in effect, an all-pervading arm of the state police.

The local prison is usually at the "hsien," or county, headquarters. This headquarters, like its Soviet counterpart, is divided into an "inquiry and detection" section, a "detention" section, and other sections dealing with staff and administrative work and open police activities. Also, like their Russian counterparts, the Chinese police exercise both police and judicial powers. They not only "investigate" and "arrest"; they also "try" and "sentence." This is one reason why Western prisoners of the Chinese often refer to their interrogations by the police as their "trials." The Chinese state police make no clear distinction between the "trials" and the "interrogations," in spite of the fact that they often carry out a *pro forma* trial and sentencing at the end of the detention period.

The original members of the Chinese Communist police system were drawn from the guerrilla training schools. After 1949 the Communists established large police-training academies. Each of these has a student body of several hundred, who receive a training similar to that of KGB officers. Many former Nationalist police have been retrained and absorbed directly into the Communist apparatus.

3. The Suspects

In China, as in the Soviet Union, those whom the Party decides are a threat to its program automatically fall into the category of suspects. Because China is still in the midst of its revolution, there are large groups of people of "bourgeois" or "reactionary" class background, all of whom are automatically suspect. This includes all members of the "official" class, all of the rural gentry, all of the business and commercial classes of the cities, and property owners in general. All of those who were in any way connected with the Nationalist government are suspect. Unlike the Russians, the Chinese apparently have not yet decided that any national minority groups indigenous to China are automatically suspect. However, all foreigners, and especially all those of Western European or American background, are automatically suspect. All Christians, and especially Roman Catholics, are suspect.

As in Russia, there are "specific" suspects, as well as general categories of suspects. Such specific suspects include persons who are the associates and relatives of other suspects, persons about whom police spies and informers have reported derogatory information, and persons who have been accused of acts or attitudes which threaten the Party or any of its programs. That those who are actual enemies of the regime are all potential suspects goes without saying. In China, as in Russia, nearly anyone in the population may become a suspect; and when he is arrested, the police always have some reason for making the arrest, whether or not this is apparent to the victim.

4. Investigation and Arrest

Observations of the investigation methods of the Chinese state police indicate that they are similar to those used by the KGB. When local security officers decide that a person is a threat to the Party or its program, they satisfy themselves that he should be arrested and then arrest him. From the point of view of the victim, it is important that the Chinese investigating procedures sometimes are not as prolonged and comprehensive as those of the KGB and the prospective victim may have much less opportunity to get wind of what is afoot. Apparently, the Chinese occasionally make quick and arbitrary decisions to carry out arrests, basing these upon the report of a single informer; thus the police may swoop down suddenly upon an unsuspecting victim, who is utterly unaware that they might have any interest in him. There are, however, other occasions on which friends, relatives, and associates have gradually disappeared, or have been questioned by the police over a period of weeks before the final arrest of the central victim, who becomes all too aware of what is in store for him.

As in Russia, the arrest procedure is usually carried out suddenly, and often at night; but the Chinese make no pretense at carrying out their arrests covertly. Often they make a large show of force. The arresting authorities may drive up in a truck with a squad of heavily armed soldiers, surround the home of the victim, and cart him off with much military ceremony. If there is a desire to impress the populace, the arrest may be staged in broad daylight under humiliating circumstances. The arresting officers do sometimes read a "warrant" to the victim. As in Russia, this warrant does not name specific crimes, but names only general ones. The victim is given only a few moments to gather together the barest of his personal essentials before being taken away.

5. Chinese Prison Routine

Usually the prisoner is taken first to a police station, where he is immediately interrogated by several police officers. This initial interrogation is relatively brief, and takes the form of an accusation. Usually, it is carried out by three officers, in full uniform. Their demeanor is invariably arrogant and hostile. As in Russia, they never state specific crimes, but they tell the prisoner that he is accused of "crimes against the people," "treason," "espionage," or some similar broad category of malefaction. Sometimes they simply state to him that he knows why he is there, and what has he to say for himself?

Usually this initial shouting and accusatory interrogation is a brief one, and the prisoner is promptly placed in a cell. However, for psychological reasons, and because of lack of prison facilities, some prisoners are put under "house arrest" immediately after their initial arrest. A single room in the prisoner's home is fixed up as a cell, and guards are assigned. The prisoner stays in this room for a indefinite period of time and is transported back and forth to the prison for further interrogations (which the prisoners often call "trials"). Under standard conditions, however, the prisoner is confined immediately to a prison cell and usually goes through an initial period of solitary confinement.

Chinese prison facilities are much more primitive than many of those in Russia and are utterly inadequate to the prison population which they must at present sustain. Crude, improvised, and extremely primitive prison conditions are often encountered.

The Chinese prisons, like the Soviet prisons, are separated into "detention

prisons" (often called "detention houses"), where prisoners are kept during the period of "investigation" up to the time the cases are "settled," and "punishment prisons" and labor camps, in which sentences are served. The "detention prisons" in large cities are modeled along the lines of the Soviet detention prisons.

In important cases, when there is a need to elicit a good deal of accurate information from the prisoner, the Chinese utilize a routine of isolation, pressure, and interrogation, which is almost identical with that used by the KGB and is described in Part II. The prisoner is placed in a small and barren cell in total isolation. His food, his sleep, his exercise, his position, his activities, and even his eliminative functions are rigidly controlled. After a suitable initial period he is interrogated nightly with increasing pressure until he capitulates. Usually his cell is dirtier and less well heated than those in Russia, and his regimen is different in details—some minor and some major. In China, for example, prisoners in isolation may be required to sleep with their hands inside the blankets rather than outside. The Chinese have a predilection for severely restricting the activities of their prisoners. It seems to be much commoner for them to require men in total isolation to sit rigidly on their bunks at all times when they are not eating, sleeping, or exercising. This adds greatly to their discomfort.

An aspect of their isolation regimen which is especially onerous to Western prisoners is the arrangement for the elimination of urine and feces. The "slop jar" that is usually present in Russian cells is often absent in China. It is a Chinese custom to allow defecation and urination only at one or two specified times each day—usually in the morning after breakfast. The prisoner is hustled from his cell by a guard, double-timed down a long corridor, and given approximately two minutes to squat over an open Chinese latrine and attend to all of his wants. The haste and the public scrutiny are especially difficult for women to tolerate. If the prisoners cannot complete their action in about two minutes, they are abruptly dragged away and back to their cells. The guards customarily allow only this one opportunity for defecation, but they may allow one or more other opportunities to urinate during the day.

All Western prisoners experience extreme discomfort and marked disturbances of bowel function when first exposed to this regimen. Many of them think of it as one of the most fiendish tortures devised by the Chinese Communists, but the practice may simply be an old routine which has been customary in China for many years. It seems to be common to all Chinese prisons, even those in the provinces. Open latrines and public defecation are the custom in rural China, and they do not seem to be regarded as unpleasant by most Chinese.

Similarly, the diet in Chinese prisons is often regarded by Western prisoners as a device for creating discomfort. Rice, millet, and bean soup are the staples. As in Soviet prisons, these are presented to the prisoner in an amount just sufficient to maintain his nutrition if he eats all that he is given. Some Western prisoners regard Chinese prison food as nauseating or distasteful and suffer accordingly. However, there is reason to believe that the Chinese Communists intend to provide in their prisons a diet equivalent to that of an average Chinese peasant or soldier.

The chief features of the isolation regimen in China are the same as those of the Soviet Union: total isolation, utter boredom, anxiety, uncertainty, fatigue, and lack of sleep; rejection, hostile treatment, and intolerable pressure; and reward and approval for compliance.

6. The Interrogator

The interrogation in Chinese prisons is sometimes carried out by two or three officers; but usually one of these is in charge of the case, and it is he who acts as the "friendly" interrogator at times when pressure is released. As in Russia, there may be only one interrogator, and sometimes two interrogators alternate. These men are relatively junior officers. Like their KGB counterparts, many of them are dedicated Communists. They may approach the prisoner with a set of preformed ideas, which are impervious to logic. Some Chinese interrogators are university graduates, and some of them have studied abroad; but many others are men whose limited education has been entirely in Communist Party schools. Such men have an ignorance of the outside world and of Western ideas which makes it even more difficult for Western prisoners to cope with them.

On the whole, Western prisoners have reported that one of the most persuasive features of Communist Chinese interrogators is their evident devotion to their cause and the enthusiastic idealism with which they subscribe to the ostensible goals of Communism. Their patient attempts to teach prisoners "the right attitude" and to get them to understand the Chinese Communist viewpoint has a potent effect upon unsophisticated or idealistic people. At the same time, the relative ignorance of some of these police officers and their dogmatic adherence to Communist beliefs in the face of obviously contrary facts may be profoundly exasperating. Under the pressures of interrogation, prisoners are usually prepared to admit to acts which actually occurred and in time to accept the Communist definition of the nature of these acts; but they have great difficulty in bringing themselves to make confessions which are wildly contrary to fact. The interrogator may insist upon such confessions because of his erroneous beliefs about the nature of Western institutions and Western motives. This may in part explain why protocols are rewritten so many times in Communist prisons, and why the confession is so often rejected as unsatisfactory after the prisoner thinks that he has finally written it in an acceptable form.

7. The Interrogation Procedure

The interrogation procedure is much the same as that used by the KGB. It is usually carried out at night and in a special room; it proceeds stepwise, with a gradual building up of pressure upon the prisoner to an intolerable point, sudden release of pressure, friendly interrogation, rewards for cooperation, and then a repetition of the whole process until a presumably satisfactory first protocol is signed. As in the Soviet Union, the Chinese interrogators adjust their attitudes to the type of man with whom they think they are dealing. They are more likely to shout, revile, and humiliate. Possibly they take this attitude more toward Western prisoners than toward members of their own populace. Their procedures seem to be less formalized, and their pressures are more apt to be primitive and brutal. Important or recalcitrant prisoners are usually interrogated during a period of isolation in a detention cell, under a routine similar to that used in Russia. Less important prisoners may be interrogated while incarcerated in "group cells." In this case the members of the cell group alter their behavior to fit the needs

of the interrogators. Prisoners in group cells may be isolated if their "confessions" are not developing in a satisfactory manner.

In addition to the procedure of long-continued standing, which is frequently employed, the Chinese also use manacles and leg chains, devices which are no longer used by the KGB. Leg chains are hobbling and uncomfortable, but the most excruciating discomfort is produced by the manacles. These are commonly in the form of iron bracelets, several inches in width, and joined rigidly together. The prisoner's hands are placed behind his back, and his wrists are locked within the manacles. The rigid joint of the manacles holds his forearms together side by side, tightly behind his back. This position is a painful one to assume for even a few moments. When a man's arms are held in this position for many hours, he develops almost unbearable pain, primarily in his shoulders and hands. The circulation to his hands is interfered with also. They become swollen and exceedingly tender. The manacles may cut into his wrists and produce wounds which become infected. The Chinese may manacle a prisoner for days or weeks at a time. Such a prisoner is helpless and degraded. In order to eat, he must lie on the floor and lap up his food. He cannot urinate or defecate without help, and frequently he soils himself. He cannot find a comfortable position for sleep. Lying on either side causes pain in the shoulders, and lying on his back is impossible because of tenderness of his hands.

Chinese interrogators and prison guards are more likely to resort to direct physical brutality than their Russian counterparts. When asked to explain the difference between Chinese methods and those of the KGB, one Russian said simply, "The Chinese use torture." This is the exception rather than the rule in their behavior, but nevertheless it occurs. Angry interrogators may slap or beat prisoners and kick them in the shins. Guards may do likewise. Among their most sadistic practices are milking the fingers of manacled prisoners and binding the ankles of those who are forced to stand. Milking pressure on the swollen fingers of a manacled hand is excruciatingly painful. Whenever loose gauze bandages are applied around the ankles of a man who is forced to stand, they seriously constrict his legs as they begin to swell. This also produces intense pain.

As in Russian prisons, medical attention is given prisoners. This is not intended to be inadequate, but it is usually grossly so by Western standards. Some Chinese physicians, like their Russian counterparts, are skilled in estimating the capacity of prisoners to withstand punishment, and usually call a halt to tortures before death or irreparable physical damage occurs.

The content of the interrogation procedure is not merely the tortures which are applied. As in Russia, the persuasion and discussion of the interrogator, which seems to provide a "way out" for the prisoner, is an essential tool in producing the desired confession.

The Chinese more frequently ask the prisoner to write out, rather than relate, his own biography, and often require him to revise it in detail. The interrogation sessions themselves can be taken up with the discussion of this biographic material, but only rarely is the biography itself obtained by direct questioning. All of the psychological devices used by the KGB interrogators are also used by the Chinese interrogators. Night interrogation, with repetitive questioning, undefined crimes, changing attitudes, and increasing pressures alternate with periods of relaxed pressure, "friendship," and reward. Cigarettes, tea, and a friendly

attitude may be the sum total of a reward for cooperation; but even this provides profound relief from the usual interrogation procedures.

The KGB rarely requires a prisoner to fabricate a completely untrue act which is logically absurd. They concentrate more upon persuading him that his actual acts constitute crimes. Chinese interrogators, on the other hand, when they are intent upon establishing charges, such as bacteriological warfare or espionage, may insist that the prisoner include in his confession detailed statements which are not only untrue but logically absurd. One has the impression that this insistence is based upon a combination of ignorance and ineptitude. Prisoners usually balk at making such statements and tend to retract them even after they have been made.* This seems to produce a profound exasperation in many interrogators. It is in such settings that much brutality occurs. Men have been kicked, beaten, starved, locked up in small boxes, hung up by their thumbs or legs, or subjected to other primitive tortures under these circumstances. This has happened especially in POW interrogations.

Persuasion and friendly discussion nevertheless play a major part in the preparation of the original confession. The same types of rationalization are used by the Chinese as are used by the KGB, and the peculiar forms of Communist logic are common to both.

8. The Indoctrination Procedure in the Group Cell

At the time the first protocol or "confession" is signed, the prisoner is usually sullen and only half-convinced, if at all. It is at this point that the Chinese procedure diverges radically from that of the other Communist countries. The Chinese are less interested in immediate trial and punishment; they are more concerned with reforming the prisoner's thoughts and acts.

At some stage in his imprisonment the prisoner can expect to find himself placed in a cell with about eight other prisoners. If he was initially isolated and interrogated, this may be shortly after his first "confession" is accepted; but many prisoners are placed in group cells from the outset of their imprisonment. The cell is usually barren, and scarcely large enough to hold the group it contains. There may be a sleeping platform, but all of the prisoners sleep on the floor; and when all lie down, every inch of floor space may be taken up. The atmosphere is extremely intimate. Privacy is entirely nonexistent. Poor food and all of the other hardships of the prison routine are present, and a new and extraordinary hardship is added as well—the psychological atmosphere.

In societies which require a rigid conformity of belief and provide severe punishment for deviation, periods of great fear may be accompanied by widespread hysterical accusations and brutal punishments. This has been an outstanding feature of the present Communist Revolution in China. Under the pressures of the Communist demands for conformity and the fear of relentless punishment, men have turned against men and children against their parents. People compete with each other to demonstrate their loyalty to the new regime and freely accuse their neighbors of deviations or suspected crimes. The Chinese Communists have intentionally fostered this fear among the general population and use it for their own ends. Certainly, they do so in the prisons. One of their most ingenious

* A person who has finally been forced into making an absurd confession will sometimes accept the confession after the most absurd parts have been deleted, even though the remaining protocol is patently untrue.

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

prison devices is that of turning prisoner against prisoner, and requiring the enemies of the regime to beat each other into conformity.

During his original interrogation, as he is urged to confess his crimes, the prisoner is told repeatedly that only when he has completely confessed his crimes and has come to realize the error of his ways can his case be settled. After he is transferred to a cell with other prisoners, it becomes clear to him what this entails. It is necessary for him to compete with other prisoners in studying, in thoughts, and in behavior until he has demonstrated to them, as well as to his jailers, that he is thoroughly "reformed" and a true adherent of Communism.

The regimen in the new cell is completely organized. The prisoners arise at a fixed hour, have a brief period for cleaning themselves, eat a frugal breakfast, and have the usual march to the latrine. Thereafter, they spend the morning in lectures, discussion sessions, and brief exercise periods. They spend the afternoon in the same sort of routine—more lectures, more discussions and self-criticism sessions. In the evenings, the discussions and self-criticism go on continuously until bedtime.

The lectures are relatively formal study sessions given by an instructor, who is either a member of the prison staff or a prisoner who is further along in his indoctrination. The textbooks are the standard books of Marxist theory.[†] The lecturer assigns topics for reading in these books. These are later taken up in "discussion sessions." Such group discussions of general topics are designed to ensure that everyone understands what he is being taught. On each point it is necessary for everyone in the group to come to precisely the same understanding, which is the one that meets with the approval of the teacher and the more thoroughly indoctrinated students. These sessions are held in the cell. Everyone is forced to participate. Attempts at nonparticipation are noticed immediately by the other prisoners, who then insist upon an expression of an opinion from the recalcitrant member and a thorough discussion and dissection of his views. Prisoners and instructors are equally assiduous at ferreting out other standard devices for avoiding commitment, such as platitudinous statements, or the mere parroting of the words of the instructors and the group without conviction. Prisoners who attempt to escape by the use of such maneuvers find themselves set upon by the other students and sharply criticized for their insincerity.

The exercise period is like that in Soviet prisons. During the earlier phase of indoctrination it usually consists of walking in the prison yard or doing calisthenics. At later stages, more advanced prisoners are permitted to play games, such as volley ball or baseball.

Further lectures and more group discussions take place in the afternoon. In addition, there are the "self-criticism" sessions, during which each prisoner is supposed to criticize his behavior in the light of proper Communist behavior and to admit all his faults. Not only one's present failures but all of one's past actions are subject to review. The biographical material from each prisoner's life history is available, and sooner or later he must review most of the items. Furthermore, all prisoners must take part in vigorous criticism of other prisoners. One is not allowed to criticize vaguely or lightly. One must criticize specific points and criticize them forcefully. The result of this is an intense outpouring of hostile accusations upon the prisoner who is the recipient of the criticism. The hostility

[†] For example, "The Communist Manifesto"; "Socialism-Utopian and Scientific"; "Imperialism—the Highest Stage of Capitalism"; "Foundations of Leninism"; "The History of Social Development"; "The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik)."

of the group grows in intensity and continues until the uncommitted prisoner shows a genuine emotional reaction that indicates a satisfying willingness to reform.

A special aspect of the group criticism is what prisoners call "the struggle." This takes place when prisoners are undergoing interrogations while being confined to group cells. The cell group is made aware of the progress of the interrogation, apparently by direct instructions from the jailers to the group leader. When the prisoner returns fatigued after an interrogating session, the group surrounds him and "struggles" to help him with his confession. They stand around him in a group, shouting at him, reviling him, and accusing him for hours at a time, constantly telling him that he must confess all in order to be treated better. Such "struggles" are often initiated when a prisoner returns from an interrogation session wearing manacles and leg chains as a sign of his unsatisfactory performance. When the prisoner finally produces a satisfactory confession and the interrogator changes his attitude, the cell group is made aware of this also, and changes its attitude toward the prisoner to a milder one.

Another technique used is that of stopping all interrogations and instructions for a period of days and ordering the prisoner to concentrate upon writing his confession and self-criticism. During this time, he is not allowed to speak to anyone in his cell, and his cell mates do not speak to him. The effect of this is to produce anxiety and doubts in the prisoner, who continues to expand his writing in the hope that he will finally produce something which will satisfy his interrogators.

This routine of lectures, discussions, self-criticism, and group criticism goes on from morning until evening throughout the week. The formal lectures alone may occupy as much as 56 hours a week. Literally no part of the prisoner's waking life is left free.

9. The Reaction of the Prisoner to the Procedure in the Group Cell

Whether by design or by accident, the psychological atmosphere within one of these group prison cells is such that ultimately the prisoner comes to see that the only hope for a "solution to his case" lies in his complete conformity in speech and behavior to the doctrine outlined by his jailers. He also learns that he must demonstrate his zeal not merely by his own behavior but also by vigorously tearing down the defenses of many other prisoners. Fear and tension in the group are thus maintained at a high pitch, and the cell mates vie with one another in accusing, criticizing, degrading, and brutally punishing their fellow prisoners.

A prisoner newly introduced into one of these cells finds himself faced with an almost irresistible assault upon the integrity of his personality. Often he is already tired, discouraged, and psychologically whipped by the previous extraction of a "confession." Furthermore, he is usually somewhat confused about his value systems, and at least partly convinced that, by Communist standards, he is a criminal. He enters the cell as a newcomer and an unregenerate. He finds that his cell mates are all people who have "changed their attitudes." Regardless of their status prior to arrest, they all seem to regard themselves as criminals; some take pride in the fact that they were the worst criminals in the lot. He may be surprised to find that the cell leader who has charge of the discussion and criticism sessions is a former Nationalist officer, or possibly a priest, or a former high Communist official.

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

The new prisoner's protestations of innocence are not accepted by his fellow prisoners. They derisively tell him that he will soon change. They all tell him that resistance is useless, that the Communist party is all-powerful, and that no one who is innocent is ever imprisoned. They promptly turn upon him and begin to "help him" in his reform. They criticize him vigorously and brutally. They point out every error in his thinking. They detect his every attempt to evade commitment and destroy it.† They do not allow protestation of innocence. Thenceforth he has no moment of peace and no shred of privacy.

The brutalities of prisoners to other prisoners are far more frequent than those of the guards. This is another interesting example of Communist legalism. The Chinese, like the KGB, have a regulation that prisoners shall not be tortured, beaten, or otherwise maltreated. Usually the interrogator and guards follow this rule. They leave physical brutality to the prisoners themselves. Amid the tensions of the group cell, prisoners can revile and degrade their fellow prisoners to an unbelievable degree. When the group decides that a prisoner is recalcitrant or reactionary, they may turn upon him and beat him mercilessly. They may deprive him of sleep, take his food away from him, spit upon him, make him stand all day, and insist that he be manacled. It is said that prisoners have even killed or seriously injured other prisoners. Occasionally the guards even intervene to protect prisoners from their cell mates. Such pressure of prisoners upon other prisoners is intentionally permitted and is interrupted only when danger to the life of the prisoner, or the policy of the prison officials, indicates that it should be stopped.

Hence, in addition to the physical discomforts inherent in this situation, the prisoner is placed under profound psychological pressure. To reiterate: Man is a social animal. His health is as much dependent upon the maintenance of satisfactory relationships with his associates as it is upon his food and drink. Even if nothing else at all were done to a prisoner, he would find it almost intolerable to be confined so intimately with seven other people who revile him and openly despise him. Some sort of psychological *modus vivendi* leading to a degree of acceptance is necessary for any man who exists in a group of other men. Absence of such an adaptation is profoundly disturbing. Added to this burden is the fact that the prisoner is a bewildered, anxious, and beaten man from the start. Furthermore, he has no privacy whatever. Every moment of his life is spent within a few inches of his fellow prisoners. There is nothing that he can do or say that escapes them. Not even his past and private life is sacred to him. Everything he has ever done or said may be held up before him. On top of this, he is physically abused, fatigued, and degraded to the point of complete collapse; but, as in the interrogation situation, he is never allowed to die and is always snatched back just before the final breaking point.

Here, again, is an intolerable situation in which no man can exist indefinitely. The prisoner must conform to the demands of the group sooner or later. Indeed, one is amazed not so much at the fact that prisoners ultimately conform as at the remarkable amount of punishment which some prisoners absorb before they do so. One would think that no man would actively resist these pressures for more than a few months; but even men who were predisposed toward conforming in the first place have been known to put up some degree of resistance for years

† Various names have been given to the tricks commonly used by prisoners to avoid commitment, such as "finding a loophole," "assuming an appearance," "spreading a smoke screen," "window dressing," etc. Each of these can become a subject for special criticism.

before finally conforming in all minor details to the demands put upon them. Even those who have a wholehearted desire to embrace Communism find themselves faced with some demands which they cannot accept, and seem to find it necessary to exhaust themselves in resisting these points before they finally "give in." It is as if the prisoner cannot accept total conformity as a solution until he has convinced himself that it is indeed inevitable.

Prisoners who enter into the cell groups may be defiant for a while but they soon learn that this brings punishment upon them, and they try some trick of ostensible compliance. This is detected, with further punishment, and rejection. Other ruses fail also. Finally, many reach a point of emotional breakdown. The mood common to this is profound depression, with crying, whimpering, and the loss of all care about personal appearance. Some prisoners become disoriented. Evidently a few have delusory experiences, but this is less common. Sometimes these emotional disturbances go on for several months, and they may recur.

In this new situation of intolerable pressure, the prisoner is again offered an attractive "way out." This attractive way out lies in the adoption of the ostensible ideals of Communism. At the expense of belaboring the point, it must be said again that the "exoteric" or "open" doctrine of Communism purports to be an espousal of the ideals of self-sacrifice, equality, peace, freedom from want, and freedom from fear, which are common to most of the major ethical systems of mankind. The prisoner is told, in effect, that the reason he is being punished is that he has failed to live up to this set of ideals. When he realizes his errors, has cleansed his thoughts, and has become a wholehearted believer, his ordeal will end. All the rationalizations of Communist logic are brought into play to make his conversion easier. From morning until night he has this drummed into him in teaching sessions from which he cannot escape.

Not only do prisoners revile and criticize each other; some of them show a sincere desire to help the new prisoner to "reform" himself. The behavior of prisoners to other prisoners cannot be seen as simply the free acting out of hostility and aggression. Intermingled with this there is a truly sincere desire on the part of some to make the new prisoner see that only by conforming and adopting the proper attitudes and beliefs can he ameliorate his situation. Some of them have sincerely adopted Communism and see themselves as actually trying to make the prisoner into a better person; others see themselves as only trying to get him to do what he must do in order to survive. In all cases this rationalization enables the prisoners to take the attitude that they are "only punishing the new prisoner for his own good." This attitude causes no difficulty for those who are Communists, or who truly regard the new prisoner as a criminal; but it is a source of great conflict for some, including some priests and missionaries, who realize that their efforts to convert the new prisoner may stem from some selfish motives on their own part, and that they have the effect of causing him to deny principles to which they themselves are dedicated. In any case, the new prisoner does become aware of the fact that there are members of the cell group who have partly concealed sympathy for him and are sincerely trying to help him. He responds to this offer of help as much as he succumbs to the constant rejection and brutality.

From time to time, he is taken out of the cell to see his interrogator for private discussions and further opportunity to confess. Private persuasion is thus added to group persuasion. The attractiveness of the "way out" is as effective in producing conversion as is the necessity of escaping torture.

The duration of the period of imprisonment in the group cell does not appear to bear any direct relation to the progress made by the prisoner in adopting Communist views. The prisoner may assume that he has been converted, but his mentors are hard to satisfy. The interrogator and the other prisoners make conversion difficult to attain. It is common practice for them to ask for a new deposition and a new "confession" from a prisoner as soon as he appears to have achieved a certain amount of "progress." This new "confession" usually goes so far beyond the previous one that the prisoner has great difficulty in accepting it. This initiates a new period of conflict and resistance on his part and starts the cycle over again. Western prisoners find it especially difficult when the interrogators ask them to confess to belonging to nonexistent espionage rings or to make other grossly invalid "confessions."

10. The Conversion

The prisoner faced with a KGB interrogation in preparation for a trial is placed in a position in which he must rationalize only a portion of his beliefs and actions in order to reach a tolerable *modus vivendi*, but the prisoner in a Chinese prison has a much more difficult adaptation; he must rationalize all of his beliefs and actions. It gradually becomes apparent to him that his ordeal may be of indefinite duration, and that there is no escape from it short of complete compliance with the demands of his captors. Sooner or later most prisoners make the necessary adaptation. They come to the point of being able to say and do the things required of them. They are able to change their thinking enough to begin to identify themselves with the values held by the prisoner group.

Here, again, the rewards of rationalization help the prisoner, just as they helped him to confess. For example, most people are not without some sense of guilt about parts of their past behavior. Such guilt, possessed by prisoners, is greatly enhanced by the criticism and accusations of their fellow prisoners. Confession, even if it is entered into with some reservations, gives a sense of relief. The feeling of "joining," "belonging," and "being accepted" by the prisoner group provides a most intense satisfaction to one who has been rejected and reviled. Nor is it always very difficult for him to accept the ostensible ideals for which the group is working. Prisoners make rationalizations such as "after all, Communism and Christianity are essentially the same thing," or others, such as "I did not think of myself as a spy, but, after all, I am a foreigner, and foreigners have done great harm to China." All evidences of "reform" and "conversion" are fostered by the patient help and teaching which the prisoner receives from some of his associates and by the approval of the interrogator.

When he finally submits, the prisoner receives a substantial reward from a feeling of acceptance and belonging. Suddenly, he has "friends." He may even be a "hero." He unites himself with the others and is buoyed up by a sense of dedication to the "mission" that they are carrying out. At this stage, he may be transferred to a "free and easy cell" where conditions are less harsh. Here he has an opportunity for reading, and he may be allowed to teach other prisoners and to take part in games. His new-found enthusiasm is abetted by recurrent "drives" that take place within the prison—drives against "hypocrisy," "waste," "graft," "corruption," and the like—all of which are fostered with enthusiastic fervor by competitions among the cell groups.

Those who have been through the Communist prison procedure often come out with the feeling that no matter how difficult it was, it was worth while. They

may even feel grateful to their mentors. They feel as if they had been destroyed, and then had been reintegrated. Some feel as if they were more "mature" than they had ever been before. This is especially true of those who had previously felt at loss for a goal in life, or who had not been committed to a set of beliefs, friendships, or an occupation. It is also true of those who have carried a heavy load of guilt about earlier behavior. In this last group, something akin to a religious "conversion" is recognizable. Such prisoners have experienced a period of degradation and intense punishment, which they find not entirely unacceptable because of their preexisting feelings of guilt and unworthiness; following this, they experience an "acceptance" and "group identification" which is more valuable to them than ever before because of the fact that they have already "confessed" and "atoned" for their sins. The previously uncommitted, and those who felt rejected by their society, may develop an exhilarating feeling of "purpose" and "belonging" which they never had before.

Even those prisoners who were previously well integrated and on good terms with their fellow men, and who were committed to certain goals and beliefs, experience a profound feeling of relief when they are finally able to make the necessary rationalizations and to join with the prisoner group. This feeling of relief probably stems from the release of tensions and restorations of body processes that occur in a man when he is finally able to make an adaptation to a very difficult environment.

Long after the prisoner has developed a willingness to conform, he continues to be exposed to an unrelenting course of Communist studies. During all of his imprisonment he is denied access to any information which might contradict what he is being told. Over a period of years this combination of misinformation and absence of contrary evidence produces some areas of distorted belief in even the most skeptical.

11. The Trial

The period of indoctrination within Chinese detention prisons has been known to continue for as long as four years. A prisoner's release from the detention prison often appears to be decided upon on the basis of general policies rather than any specific aspects of his case. The release of foreign nationals is usually determined upon the basis of propaganda needs or the requirements of international agreements. Often release comes upon a prisoner quite unexpectedly. He is suddenly told that he will be freed. Within a few days he is taken before a "court," which is much like a Soviet military tribunal. There is a "judge," a "prosecutor," perhaps a few stenographers, and sometimes a "defense attorney." The prisoner repeats his confession in what he has long since learned is the proper manner. The defense attorney asks for lenience. (There are no pleas of "not guilty.") The "judge" then "passes sentence." If it has been decided to free the prisoner entirely, he is usually sentenced to a term in "prison" equal to the amount of time he has spent in the "detention prison," and then (if he is a foreigner) to deportation. The "lenient" judge then allows the prisoner to count his time in the "detention prison" as if it were "real imprisonment," and he is forthwith released. But if he is "to be punished," he will be sent to a labor camp or to some other punishment institution to begin his sentence.

12. The "Brain-Washed"

The people who have been described in the public press as "brain-washed"

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

have been prisoners suddenly released after periods as long as four years in Chinese detention prisons. Such persons have appeared at the border at Hong Kong, looking calm, fit, and sane. They praise their captors, praise Communism, and damn "American imperialism." It is said that their old acquaintances are amazed, and that their political attitudes seem to have "changed completely." The fact that they praise their captors is regarded as the most amazing of all, for it is known that they have been through many horrible experiences in the course of their imprisonment. It is from this pattern of behavior that the impression has arisen that the Chinese possess esoteric and devilish methods of "thought control" which no man can resist.

A number of people called "successfully brain-washed" have been studied intensively. A great deal is known about these people and what was done to them. The study of these people reveals that they possessed certain characteristics in common before they were imprisoned. These can be enumerated.

1. They were people who, long before their imprisonment, were in rebellion against their parents and the way of life of the segment of society to which their parents belonged, including many of its standards, beliefs, and practices.

2. They were people who had few friends within their homeland, and no place, organization, or occupation there with which they were firmly identified. So far as their native country was concerned, they were emotionally rootless.

3. They were people who had previously identified themselves with the "under-dog." They felt a strong sympathy for all people whom they regarded as "oppressed" or "exploited," and especially for minority groups of different racial or cultural origin.

4. They all spoke Chinese fluently, and for many years had had a strong interest in China and all things Chinese.

5. Most of them were previously familiar with the exoteric concepts of Marxist socialism, and most of them had been intellectually sympathetic to socialist ideas for many years before their imprisonment. Several of them had been members of Communist and fellow-traveler groups, and at least one of them is known to have been a Party member.

6. These people had been offered repatriation after the Communist Revolution, but they had elected to remain in China, most of them primarily because they were both sympathetic to the Chinese Communist Revolution and curious to see how it would work out. They were anxious to help develop the new China, if they were allowed to do so. For months prior to the time of their imprisonment, several of them were engaged in studying Chinese Communist literature and translating it into other languages.

Most of these people were not actually Communist Party members before their arrest and imprisonment. Most of them were sympathetic to Communist ideas and to the new China, but they had not committed themselves to Communism. They had toyed with their beliefs and found them intellectually attractive, but they were content to let their identification remain at this level. They had studied Chinese, and some went to Chinese schools; but they continued to associate with the members of the Western colony, and the forms of their lives were those common to expatriate Americans and Europeans living in Chinese cities. At the time of their arrests they were still rootless, uncommitted people.

7. Nearly all of these people were arrested on charges which included "espionage." The treatment which they received in prison was that which has been described above. These people confessed to "espionage," and after their release

some of them continued for a while to state that they had been "spies." None of them had actually committed espionage, and none were actually associated with American intelligence organizations. But all of them had, with innocent intent, done various things, such as describing economic conditions in letters or discussing the morale of Communist troops with their consular officials, which were "ostensibly" espionage by Communist definition and which were forbidden by Chinese Communist law. By Communist definition, all of them were of "reactionary background" and "the agents of an Imperialist power," and they had all "committed espionage." During the course of their imprisonment, they "admitted" their acts and accepted the Communist definition of them. The rationalizations which they utilized in making their confessions were like those which have been described above.

8. To a certain extent, they were also "converted" to the acceptance of Communist doctrine. That is to say, after much soul searching and profound emotional turmoil, they committed themselves to have faith in, and to work for, some of the overt Communist ideals which they had previously accepted only on an intellectual basis. Some of them emerged from prison with a sense of purpose and worthiness which they had not felt before. They remained overtly and actively pro-Communist for periods up to several months. After that time most of them appear to have reverted to their former positions of intellectual acceptance of some Communist beliefs, while outwardly conforming to a proper middle-class life.

In summary, the study of these "successfully brain-washed" people revealed them to be persons who had previously lost their identification with the society in which they originated, and who under years of intense pressure were temporarily persuaded to "commit" themselves to beliefs which most of them already found intellectually attractive.

13. The Effectiveness of Chinese Communist Indoctrination Procedures

Just how effective are these procedures? How long-lasting are their effects? Do they actually affect brain function? Are they "irresistible"? The answer to these questions, like the answer to those about Russian "public confession" trials, is not simple, but it is available.

The Chinese prison indoctrination procedure is never more than partly effective, but it always has some effect. No human can live through months or years of this experience without suffering emotional turmoil. In order to survive and not suffer an emotional breakdown, he must make some rationalization which allows him to identify with the prison group and to relieve some of the pressures upon himself. The extent of this rationalization need not be greater than a belief that his present situation justifies his present behavior and statements. Usually, it goes further than this. He usually finds some aspects of Communist doctrine which he can admire and which he can identify with his own value systems. Also, because of his long period (sometimes years) of incarceration and exposure to propaganda, with a total absence of accurate information from the outside world, he may unwittingly adopt some Communist beliefs about current events. On some other questions, he may have at least a tentative acceptance of Communist attitudes because he has been presented with a great deal of plausible propaganda "evidence."

Thus, a man who spends a long period in a Chinese civil prison and survives

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

can be expected to have experienced anxiety, despair, and doubt; he must have complied with the prison rules; he must have "confessed" to something, and he must have taken part in the various aspects of the indoctrination procedure. If the procedure was as vigorous and thoroughgoing as that described above, he must have shown enough evidence of conversion to satisfy his cell mates and jailers, and this usually means that he must have found at least some part of the Chinese Communist value system which he can identify with his own and can tentatively accept.

On the other hand, even though some of his attitudes and beliefs may have changed, his capacity to think is not altered. So-called "brain washing" produces no permanent changes in the function of the brain. Any form of imprisonment may induce a prison psychosis, and inhuman treatment may produce physical damage to the nervous system; but these effects are not peculiar to "brain washing."

Nor is there any unexplainable deficiency in the memory of former prisoners. Prisoners do not remember things which happened when they were delirious or otherwise psychotic. They may forget minor details of their experiences with the passage of time. Many of them do not wish to discuss some points of their treatment, because the memories of these are painful and the discussion of them is disturbing. But even the "most brain-washed" are capable of a vivid recollection of what occurred during their imprisonment.

Furthermore, the majority of those released carry with them an intense bitterness about some part of their imprisonment. Usually this is directed at certain other prisoners or jailers, but it may be directed at the whole Communist system. All prisoners come out with a realization that they have been cut off from the Western world for a long time, and with a suspicion that not everything in the outside world will turn out to be as it was presented to them in prison. All of them have a tentative orientation toward whatever new beliefs they may have, and most of them have reservations about their entire experience.

Upon their release, former prisoners set about a process of "reality testing." Without committing himself, each newly released man characteristically begins to talk to friends, and to listen to accounts of what has happened while he was away in prison. He begins to read back copies of books and magazines. He begins to compare what was told him with the facts as observed and reported in the American press. The available evidence suggests that within a period of months he readjusts himself to the outside world and resumes a set of beliefs roughly similar to those he held prior to his imprisonment.

Thus, it is quite erroneous to think that those who have experienced prison indoctrination in Communist China emerge as thoroughly indoctrinated Communists who express praise and admiration for their captors. Such people are as unusual as the public confessors in Russian purge trials. The vast majority of released prisoners say little or nothing. What pro-Communist beliefs they have they keep to themselves and express only in private. Many are bitterly anti-Communist. Although they are willing to admit that there are good aspects about the regime and agree that they cooperated and "confessed" while in prison, they do not have any genuine identification with Communism.

IV. Relation of State Police Procedures, Military Interrogation, and Indoctrination of Civilians and Prisoners of War in Communist Countries

In Western states the custody of prisoners of war is in the hands of the armed

forces. In the Soviet Union during the latter part of the Second World War this was not the case. In 1942 an arrangement was arrived at between the Red Army and the NKVD which gave to the army custody of prisoners shortly after their capture and during the period of field interrogation, but turned over to the NKVD the problem of their ultimate custody and utilization. The fact that the NKVD was primarily a police organization was probably responsible for the methods and attitudes which it adopted in handling the war prisoners. In the extraction of information from prisoners, it simply applied the standard secret police techniques which had found to be so effective in handling civilian prisoners during the previous 25 years. The NKVD training program rapidly produced a large body of interrogators who were proficient in speaking German. A dossier was prepared on each German prisoner of war, which included a long biographical statement from him, as well as information gathered from the interrogation of other prisoners and from captured records. This was used in his interrogation. When prisoners gave information voluntarily, no additional pressure was put upon them; but when the interrogators felt that the prisoner was withholding information, they put him through the standard isolation pressures—repetitive interrogation techniques of the NKVD.

In typical Communist legalistic fashion, the NKVD rationalized its use of torture and pressures in the interrogation of prisoners of war. When it desired to use such methods against a prisoner or to obtain from him a propaganda statement or "confession," it simply declared the prisoner a "war-crimes suspect" and informed him that, therefore, he was not subject to international rules governing the treatment of prisoners of war. This legalism later had great importance for the United States, because it was also used against American military personnel in the Korean War. We can expect that it will be used against us in any future conflict. When it signed the Geneva agreements in 1949, the Soviet Union made specific exceptions to the effect that prisoners accused of war crimes would not be protected by the code, but would be subject to the laws of the nation against whom the crimes were committed.

Thus, German prisoners of war found themselves the subjects for criminal interrogation by secret police interrogators at the will of their Soviet captors. Similarly, they found themselves exposed to the same type of treatment that the Soviets provide for civilian political prisoners. The officers were separated from the enlisted men, and the enlisted men were utilized as a source of labor. Those prisoners who lived together in camps were also exposed to the type of indoctrination which the NKVD had developed for civilian prisoners according to the Communist philosophy of "rehabilitating" prisoners by "education and healthful work." This indoctrination consisted of lectures on Communism and group-discussion sessions, using the standard Marxist texts. The prison camps were infiltrated by large numbers of informers, who created internal dissension among the prison group and prevented the development of any organized resistance. In spite of this, the indoctrination program does not seem to have been outstandingly successful. It is estimated that only some 10% of German prisoners of war developed any sympathy for Communism, although many more cooperated with the Russians in order to secure better treatment. This proportion of successful converts is not especially high when one considers the fact that Germany had a large and vigorous Communist party before the advent of Hitler. The German army must have contained a fairly large number of men of underlying Communist sympathies.

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

Against the Japanese, the Russians used methods which were essentially the same as those which they used against the Germans, and with perhaps equal success. It is noteworthy that during the period 1945-1946 the deliberately increased the hardships and neglect within their prison camps, and thereby caused the death of a large number of prisoners they then held. Their policy was as much one of extermination as of conversion, but a higher proportion of those who were cooperative or converted survived because of the better treatment which they received.

The conversion of POW's always played a much greater role in the Chinese Communist military program than in that of the Soviet. It has been said that the Chinese Communists looked upon the entire Chinese nation as potential converts. They made their conversion and indoctrination program one of the most important aspects of their revolutionary effort. In 1943 this program was placed in the hands of Liu Shao-Ch'i, who was responsible for the form which it took thereafter. The conversion program within the Chinese prisons, which we have previously described, was developed out of the program which Liu Shao-Ch'i developed for use against the population in general.

Every prisoner or potential convert who fell into the hands of the Chinese Communists was evaluated on the basis of his life history, class background, education, and abilities. Those with revolutionary sympathies who possessed the proper background and abilities (especially students, intellectuals, and some proletarians and peasants) were trained to become Communist activists. These are the people whom the Communists commonly refer to as "cadres," both individually and in groups. For the purpose of the cadres' training, schools were set up offering a course of one year's duration. Students who entered these schools were isolated from the rest of society. They were put through an intensive and unremitting program of study and physical work, which occupied every moment of their waking hours and left them no time for reflection. The first phase of this program consisted of "tail cutting," or the devaluation of old methods of thought and behavior and old value systems. This was accompanied by the use of the self-criticism and group-criticism techniques and by exhaustive lectures on Communism. As in the prisons, the emotional fervor of the group was maintained at a high pitch by the stimulation of intense competitiveness and the organization of "moves" and "drives" of one sort or another with "voluntary participation," from which no student could shrink because of group pressure. An atmosphere of fear was created by the occasional disappearance of students who were doing poorly, accompanied by rumors about their imprisonment or transfer to labor battalions.

In many respects the atmosphere within these training schools paralleled that within the prisons. Under the relentless pressure of hard work, fatigue, increasing demands, group pressures, criticism, doubts, and ridicule, the majority of students ultimately reached the point at which they went through an emotional crisis associated with tears and depression. At this point some dropped out, but most found themselves able to make the necessary adaptation by reorienting their value systems and identifying themselves with the Communist group. A religious fervor and a feeling of "conversion" frequently accompanied this emotional breakdown and recovery. His new Communist fervor and group identification continued as long as the student remained an active member of the class group and often later in his party group, but it is said that a fair proportion of students

suffered from one or more relapses of tears and doubts. It is known that some defected later when the opportunity presented itself.

In the population at large, the Chinese Communists have not been able to carry out indoctrination in nearly so tightly organized a fashion, but their approach has been essentially the same as their approach to the cadres. They aim their indoctrination primarily at the younger groups and carry out their programs with a special vigor in the schools and universities. Villages have been exposed to propaganda and a certain amount of lectures and teaching. Group-discussion and self-criticism sessions have been held. These are accompanied by an attempt to devalue the old practices and substitute the Communist value system. An atmosphere of fear produced by liquidations, arrests, and accusations is exploited. All of this has had the effect of producing superficial conformity and acquiescence.

Americans have had firsthand experience with the Chinese methods of indoctrination of prisoners of war. These methods have been made the subject of exhaustive studies by the Army and Air Force and by the Defense Advisory Committee on Prisoners of War. We shall not attempt to add to their voluminous documentation. However, we may consider briefly the experiences of our prisoners in the light of what we know about Russian and Chinese practices in general.

It is evident that the North Koreans were ill prepared to cope with American prisoners from any point of view. They possessed very few English-speaking interrogators and had no prepared facilities for the semipermanent custody of prisoners of war. Much of what appeared to be calculated brutality and deliberate extermination on the part of the North Koreans and the Chinese Communists in the winter of 1950-1951 was probably the result of lack of facilities, the breakdown of supply and communication, and callousness of Oriental peasant soldiers. The initial demoralization of American prisoners by the physical hardships of their captivity was probably not intentionally designed. Attempts to indoctrinate American prisoners were poorly organized and ineptly carried out when compared with the procedures used by the Chinese on their own populace. All too often the lecturers were absurdly ignorant of American conditions. The preparation of dossiers on individual prisoners was not nearly so thoroughgoing as that employed by the Soviets or by the Chinese in their own prisons. But the use of informers among the prisoner group and the isolation and removal of natural leaders were relatively successful in demoralizing the prisoners and in preventing the organization of active resistance groups.

The Chinese used the technique of accusing American prisoners of "war crimes" when they wished to expose them to a "criminal interrogation" with the aim of obtaining a propaganda confession, or when they wished to mete out some "appropriate" punishment to a marked man. This device was primarily used in obtaining bacteriological-warfare confessions from the aviators captured during the period of 1952-1953. All told, 78 aviators are known to have been exposed to such interrogation within North Korea. Of these, 38 "confessed," and 40 did not. The methods used in obtaining these confessions were similar to those used in the Chinese-Soviet prisons. They were characterized by a striking, and often extreme, degree of physical brutality. These officers were isolated, sometimes in unheated huts or water-soaked holes in the ground. They were deprived of sleep, food, warmth, and exercise. They were insulted, threatened, beaten, and repeatedly interrogated, and they were intermittently offered kind treatment if they assented to the demands of their captors. One gains the im-

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

pression that a good deal of this brutality, which included such things as mock firing squads, dousing prisoners with water in subzero weather, and the incarceration of men in small boxes, was simply a result of lack of sophistication and callousness on the part of the North Korean interrogators. Also, brutality was precipitated by the exasperating resistance of many of the prisoners. These men were being asked to confess to something which they knew to be palpably untrue, and there was no way of looking upon it in any other fashion. It is notoriously difficult to get men to make such confessions.

The resistance of these prisoners appeared to bear no direct relation to the amount of physical pressure put upon them by their Communist captors. Some men were brutalized for months without giving in; others succumbed almost immediately, sometimes with scarcely as much as a threat. Statistical correlations made by research groups of the U. S. Air Force indicate that resistance did not correlate with rank, education, religion, geographical area of origin, length of service, or regular or reserve status. The information from our own studies suggests very strongly that resistance or nonresistance is related to highly personal factors involving motivations, value systems, character structure, and the circumstances of imprisonment.

The available information all points to a readily understandable explanation for the defection of those few Americans who elected to remain in Communist lands. Nearly all of these men were of limited schooling and experience. It appears that few of them had any real interest in Communism. They defected primarily because they were afraid to be repatriated. Most of them had been regarded by their fellow prisoners as informers and collaborators, and they all had good reason to expect charges to be preferred against them if they returned to the jurisdiction of the United States. They were lured into defection by what amounted to rosy promises of further education and economic betterment if they went to China. When it turned out that their situation in China was far less rosy than they expected it to be, some were sorely disappointed and returned to the United States.

It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the behavior of our prisoners of war. This has been dealt with ably in publications of the U. S. Army and U. S. Air Force, and in the report of the Defense Advisory Committee on Prisoners of War. Suffice it to say that in every case that has been investigated, the statements and behavior of the men have been found to have a readily understandable basis.

V. Some Theoretical Considerations

A central theme of this paper has been the proposition that there is no need to assume that the Communists utilize occult methods in managing their prisoners. The results obtained are readily understandable on the basis of the methods known to be used. Theory has been avoided, because many present-day concepts of human behavior are still in a formulative state. Notwithstanding this, there is a sufficient body of evidence to allow us to state that we understand why the results obtained flow from the methods used.

It is helpful to consider the individual man as a living system entirely dependent upon maintaining a satisfactory relationship with his total environment. A man's life is dependent upon his ability to maintain a satisfactory body temperature; a satisfactory intake of food, fluids and air; a satisfactory elimination of waste products, and a satisfactory amount of rest and activity. It is equally necessary for him to maintain a satisfactory relationship with the other human beings in his

environment, and especially with those humans who by kinship or long association have acquired a special meaning for him.

When any of these necessary relationships between a man and his environment are disturbed, there develop within him feelings which are unpleasant, and which stimulate him to take whatever action is necessary to bring them to an end. Among these unpleasant sensations are hunger, thirst, fatigue, sleeplessness, excessive warmth or coldness, and all sorts of pain. These sensations originate within the human body as a result of disturbances of bodily processes. There are other unpleasant feelings, such as anxiety, fear, anger, loneliness, sadness, and dejection, which arise out of disturbed relations to the total environment and the people in it. When beset by these feelings, man is strongly motivated to make whatever adjustments in his relation to his environment are necessary.

The Communist arrest-imprisonment procedure has the effect of seriously disturbing man's total relation to his environment. It produces many disturbing and unpleasant sensations within him. In the description of the procedures of arrest, isolation, interrogation, and torture, it was mentioned that these produce anxiety, fear, tension, resentment, uncertainty, loneliness, boredom, fatigue, sleeplessness, hunger, coldness, and pain.

When men are put into situations which produce pressures similar to those produced by the Communist imprisonment situation, many follow a similar pattern of reaction. The first part of this reaction is a period of patient and purposeful exploratory activity. The man carefully tries every possible solution to the situation which may relieve him of the pressures upon him. If one arranges the experimental situation so that the man cannot find a satisfactory solution by his exploratory activities, his next reaction is an increasing and random exploration, with a general increase of motor activity and an overflow of this activity into other behavior, of a nonpurposive nature. He appears to "become excited" and shows evidences of anxiety, hyperactivity, and sometimes panic. If the pressures of the experimental situation are continued, the hyperactivity of the subject will gradually subside, with the exception of isolated repetitive acts. He may settle upon one form of response, which he repeats endlessly and automatically, even though this endlessly repeated action can never produce a solution. If the pressures are continued long enough, his ultimate response is one of total inactivity. He becomes first exasperated, and finally dejected and dependent upon anyone who offers to help him. He becomes unusually receptive to approval or human support.

For want of a better term, the experimental situation just described has been called a "situation of frustration." Situations of frustration are the common denominator of many of the Communist prison experiences. The reaction of the prisoner to the isolation routine closely reproduces that which occurs in an artificially frustrating situation. It is a more all-embracing reaction, slower in its development and more devastating in its effects, but it is basically similar. Situations of frustration also occur in the interrogation situation, where the prisoner must prepare a satisfactory confession and finds that no matter what he does or says he cannot satisfy the interrogator. Likewise, situations of frustration occur again and again in a group cell in the Chinese prison. Here also the prisoner finds that no matter how much he attempts to comply with the demands of the interrogator and the other prisoners, his confession is never satisfactory, and his ordeal is renewed. Much the same situation occurs in the training schools for Communist cadres, where there are increasing demands for more thorough study, more work, more en-

thusiasm, and more self-criticism, until the student ultimately breaks down, showing emotional reactions, such as crying and behavior of hopelessness and despair.

Thus, all of the Communist interrogation and indoctrination programs have much in common. In all of them the subject is faced with pressure upon pressure and discomfort upon discomfort, and none of his attempts to deal with his situation lead to amelioration of his lot. Psychiatrists may refer to a man in such a situation as "emotionally bankrupt." Some of the patients who seek the help of psychiatrists are in a similar state. The pressures and convolutions of their lives have reached a point at which they can no longer deal with them, and they must have help. It is recognized that such a state of "emotional bankruptcy" provides a good opportunity for the therapist. Indeed, there are therapists who are of the opinion that successful psychotherapy is rare unless a patient has reached such a state of readiness. This appears to be a recognition of the fact that a man will not turn to a therapist for help as long as he feels that there are other means of deliverance.

When a man is at the "end of his rope," he accepts avidly any help that is offered. In the experimental situation of frustration, the subject who has reached this stage will readily accept suggestions for solving the experimental problem, however absurd. His response to words of encouragement is striking. His own intense needs have prepared him to accept suggestions which he previously would have rejected. Similarly, the patient who has reached a point of desperation may abjectly put himself into the hands of a psychiatrist toward whom he has previously displayed contempt and hostility, and he will enter into a course of treatment, however painful it may be.

A characteristic of those who are "bankrupt" and need help is their need to talk. They obtain deep satisfaction simply from unburdening themselves to another human being. In Communist prisons this need to talk is greatly fortified by the regimen of total isolation. This is an important reason why the Communist interrogator, being the only man to whom the prisoner talks, is in such an advantageous position for obtaining information from him. The interrogator is dealing with a man who might be looked upon as an intentionally created patient; the interrogator has all of the advantages and opportunities which accrue to a therapist dealing with a patient in desperate need of help.

Although the Communist management of prisoners was not designed by psychiatrists or neurophysiologists, and those who carry out this management do not have formal psychological training, nevertheless the interrogator does deal with the prisoner by using many of the same methods which the physician uses in the management of his patients. He allows the prisoner to talk at length about his family and his life. This produces in the prisoner a warm and dependent relationship toward him. The interrogator approves and rewards proper attitudes and behavior, and disapproves and punishes improper attitudes and behavior. Because of his dependence upon the interrogator, the prisoner develops an intense desire to please him. The prisoner glows when he is rewarded, and is deeply disturbed when he is rejected.

The interrogator has in his hands knowledge of most of the life history of his victim. He does not hesitate to pick out from this history the disturbing and unpleasant episodes. He uses them as a lever to humiliate the prisoner and to increase his feelings of guilt and unworthiness. The potent effect which this procedure can have upon man has been demonstrated many times in the laboratory. It has been observed that when threatening episodes from a patient's life are introduced by the

physician and discussed intensively with indications of disapproval, the patient may be greatly disturbed. Not only are his mood and behavior disturbed, but profound and potentially dangerous alterations in his bodily processes occur also. Thus, the power which the interrogator possesses in dealing with the prisoner is great; his ability to manipulate both the physical and the interpersonal aspects of the prisoner's environment place his victim in a highly vulnerable position.

It is readily understandable that the prisoner ultimately adopts the suggestions of the interrogator with regard to the protocol. It is not at all incomprehensible that some prisoners can be carried to the point of confessing to crimes for which death is the certain punishment. Since the intimate interpersonal relation between prisoner and interrogator continues through the period of the trial, it is also understandable that prisoners may continue to play their prescribed roles before the judge and the state prosecutor.

The situation within the group prison cell in the Chinese prison is akin to that of the interrogator and prisoner. Here, the important relationship is between the prisoner and the group, with the prisoner striving to gain the acceptance of the group and to identify himself with them. In this setting the pressures are more prolonged and the situation of frustration may be repeated many times, because the prisoner is called upon not only to accept a protocol or confession but to adopt a whole new attitude. It may take a long time before such a state of utter defeat is achieved; but when it is, the prisoner's reaction has many of the features of a religious conversion.

Those who have experienced a true religious conversion maintain their new attitudes and behavior for an unpredictable length of time. It has been a general experience that most of the religious conversions experienced at camp meetings or revivals are of evanescent nature. The experience is a powerful one, but the convert usually reverts to his former patterns within a short time. But this is not necessarily so. Some religious conversions have long-lasting, or even permanent, effects. So it appears to be with the conversion which takes place in Communist prisons or indoctrination schools. Those who go through the experience often feel that it was unpleasant but worth while. Its effects upon their attitudes and behavior are usually evanescent. They disappear within a few weeks after the convert is removed from his Communist environment. But a small proportion of converts appear to experience long-lasting, or even permanent, changes in their attitudes and behavior, especially if they are among the "most susceptible group."

VI. Epitome

The methods used in Communist countries for the interrogation and indoctrination of persons regarded as enemies of the state have their roots in secret police practices which go back for many years. These methods have been refined and systematized by much use and experience. Data about these procedures have been collected and analyzed. The general dynamic features which underlie them are understandable.

Those who live in Communist states recognize that at times the state police are almost unlimited in their power and their action may be swift and arbitrary. When residents of such communities become aware that they are suspected by the police, their feelings of impotence and uncertainty are greatly augmented. As they are increasingly avoided by their friends and associates, they feel isolated

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION OF PRISONERS

and rejected, and develop intense anxiety, often colored by feelings of guilt. Their sudden seizure under dramatic circumstances is additionally traumatizing. They usually enter upon their prison experience feeling fearful, vaguely guilty, helpless, and completely uncertain of their fate.

When the initial period of imprisonment is one of total isolation, such as that used by the KGB, the complete separation of the prisoner from the companionship and support of others, his utter loneliness, and his prolonged uncertainty have a further disorganizing effect upon him. Fatigue, sleep loss, pain, cold, hunger, and the like augment the injury induced by isolation. The cumulative effects of the entire experience may be almost intolerable. With the passage of time, the prisoner usually develops an intense need to be relieved of the pressures put upon him and to have some human companionship. He may have a very strong urge to talk to any human and be utterly dependent upon anyone who will help him or befriend him. At about this time he also becomes mentally dull and loses his capacity for discrimination. He becomes malleable and suggestible, and in some instances he may confabulate.

The interrogator exploits the prisoner's need for companionship. He uses items from the prisoner's biography derived from police files, from the prisoner's associates, and from hours of interrogation to arouse further guilt, conflict, and anxiety. He makes use of the dependence of the prisoner, which is strengthened by the intimate sharing of information about his life. He frustrates and further disorganizes the prisoner by rejecting his statements. He scolds, punishes, and threatens him when he does not cooperate, and approves and rewards him when he does. Then, by suggesting that the prisoner accept half-truths and plausible distortions of the truth, he makes it possible for the prisoner to rationalize and thus accept the interrogator's viewpoint as the only way out of an intolerable situation.

The methods of interrogation and indoctrination used in Communist China are in many respects similar to those of the Russian state police, from which they were in part derived; but in some respects they are quite different because of the special needs and traditions of the Chinese. In the Chinese prison, the individual interrogator is still important, and in occasional cases the management of the prisoner may quite closely duplicate that of the KGB. But in most instances the efforts of the interrogator are supplemented by the effects of the interaction between the prisoner and six or eight of his fellow prisoners with whom he is incarcerated in a crowded cell. Here the group replaces the interrogator as the focus of the prisoner's relationships. In this setting of complete lack of privacy, there is an unrelenting routine of self-criticism sessions, group-discussion sessions, rote learning, constant repetition of Communist viewpoints, and the repeated rewriting and rejection of autobiographical essays. The group exploits the feeling of emotional nakedness and unworthiness which the self-criticism sessions engender, dwelling upon items obtained from the prisoner's life history during these sessions which arouse in him guilt, conflict, and anxiety. These feelings are greatly potentiated when the group rejects, isolates, and reviles him because of his "improper" attitudes and past behavior. The prisoner is thus placed in a situation in which he cannot avoid having his past life reviewed and questioned and cannot avoid hearing an exposition of the Communist position. Moreover, for a period, sometimes of years' duration, he has access to nothing but Communist-oriented history and Communist inter-

pretation of current events. Like the KGB interrogator, the group rewards and approves the prisoner when he cooperates and behaves in accordance with their aims, and thus indicates to him that the only possible solution to an intolerable situation is the acceptance of the "proper" point of view.

Under pressures such as these, prisoners usually rationalize a change in attitude and hold it for an indefinite time. In general, this change in attitude is only so great as the prisoner feels it must be to enable him to relieve himself of the intolerable pressures under which he labors. In the KGB pre-trial interrogation, the achievement of a successful rationalization and a satisfactory protocol is usually accompanied by a profound feeling of relief, and an unspoken agreement with the interrogator that may even have overtones of warmth and friendliness. In the Chinese group cell, where the pressures are much more prolonged and the demands upon the prisoner are correspondingly more intense, the ultimate achievement of a proper rationalization and group acceptance is associated with feelings of relief that are occasionally exhilarating, and sometimes show some of the features of a religious "conversion."

Men under the complete control of Communist police have been made to say and do many things which their captors desire. Some people have proved to be much more malleable than others; but even under the most strenuous circumstances some men are remarkably refractory and refuse to cooperate with their captors up to the point at which they develop confusional states and delirium. The most effective features of the Communist procedures are those which would operate even in the absence of control. Prisoners who were not excessively abused and who encountered men who appeared to be dedicated, selfless, and even "idealistic" in their attachment to the ostensible goals of Communism have acknowledged these features of their captors; and those who were presented with plausible evidence have accepted it tentatively. When they have discovered that they would be rejected, reviled, and punished for non-cooperative behavior, they have refrained from doing or saying anything which would bring such abuse upon them when they were in Communist control. Those whose past lives have been colored by feelings of much guilt, by lack of purpose or commitment, and those who were previously sympathetic to Communist views have been more amenable to the Communist methods.

Prisoners who have been released from Communist control and have been able to assure themselves that they will no longer be punished for "improper" opinions have gradually readjusted their attitudes to their new environment. Their memories of the punishments and brutalities which they have endured have been lively. For most prisoners these memories override all others. When they have felt safe to acknowledge their resentment, they have expressed extreme hostility toward those responsible for their bad prison experiences, and they have nearly always rejected Communism and all those connected with it.